FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Supplement

Soviet Union

Congress of People's Deputies
Stenographic Record

FBIS-SOV-89-127-S
Wednesday
5 July 1989

Soviet Union
SUPPLEMENT
Congress of People's Deputies
Stenographic Record

FBIS-SOV-89-127-S *5 July 1989*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: The Daily Report is publishing the full translation of IZVESTIYA's "stenographic record" of the Congress of People's Deputies. Additional supplements will be issued as translated material becomes available.

STENOGRAPHIC RECORD

Congress Proceedings Continue 31 May 1
Seventh Session *[IZVESTIYA 2 Jun]* 1

Congress Proceedings Continue 31 May

Seventh Session

18300675 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
2 Jun 89 Morning Edition pp 1, 4-10

["USSR Congress of People's Deputies. Stenographic Record."—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text]

Seventh Session

31 May 1989. Kremlin Palace of Congresses. 1000.

The session is chaired by USSR People's Deputy A.-M.K. Brazauskas.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Comrades, let us begin our morning session. We are continuing the discussion on the basic trends of domestic and foreign policy of the USSR. As was already announced, Deputy Vasiliy Aleksandrovich Starodubtsev, deputy from kolkhozes [collective farms] united within the Union Council of Kolkhozes, has the floor. The next speaker will be Comrade Vladimir Ivanovich Kolesnikov.

V.A. Starodubtsev, chairman of the V.I. Lenin Kolkhoz Breeding Farm, RSFSR, Tula Oblast, Novomoskovskiy Rayon, Sokolniki (from the kolkhozes united within the Union Council of Kolkhozes): Comrade deputies, this is the sixth day of proceedings of the congress. We are discussing one of the major items on the agenda. The report "On the Basic Trends of USSR Domestic and Foreign Policy" has been submitted for consideration by the deputies. It provides a political assessment of the distance we have covered and earmarks a program for the future. However, this is no time to be enthused and hastily engage in high praises. If one looks at each line of the program, if one weighs and compares the past to the present and the future, one is unwittingly concerned. Is this the way we are solving the problem? Is this the path we are following? I recently toured stores in Tula and in some oblast cities. The shelves were half-empty and there were tense lines even for items which until recently were available. Colleagues from other oblasts say that their situation is even worse. What have we come up to? It is almost as bad as was the situation during wartime: Soap is being issued and even not everywhere are rationing points for meat products backed by resources. We can no longer live this way.

Everyone realizes that the country will not come out of the impasse unless the food problem has been solved. The people have been repeatedly promised that the situation will be corrected. However, there have been no noticeable changes, and the situation has clearly deteriorated in the case of many items.

Today we are essentially issuing the latest promissory note. It is my conviction, however, that such assurances may share the fate of the previous programs, for no serious economic foundations have been laid under the new promises. This is the common concern of more than 400 agricultural deputies who have instructed me to speak out at this congress.

All the time we keep claiming that we are eliminating the disparity between town and country. The disparity remains and the countryside is being wiped off! It is mind boggling: Over the past 20 years more than 100,000 villages have disappeared from the face of the earth. This process is continuing. Every year in Russia alone 3,000 settlements die out. Many of them, although still alive, are leading a pitiful existence. The problems of modern production are snowballing behind these dangerous processes. This perfectly reflects the state policy toward our agriculture. Based on all past and present experience we must acknowledge that in this case tactics and strategy suffer from major errors. To this day, with one campaign following another, it is hardly possible to expect any stability in the work. This too creates fertile grounds for irresponsibility on all management levels. Furthermore, the initiative on reorganization, coming from above, is only leading to a change in shingles with practically no improvements in production affairs.

All of us agree that restructuring will not develop unless we can feed the people. Many are those who agree that the time has come to give real help to the peasant. Furthermore, many of the deputies who attended the work of the 19th All-Union Party Conference mentioned this openly. Its resolutions, as you will recall, ascribed prime significance to the development of the agroindustrial complex. Unfortunately, this remained nothing more than a political appeal. No serious steps were taken to implement it in practice. Furthermore, many party and soviet managers, scientists, and the press are promoting the view that the only reason for the shortage of food is that our peasant works poorly, that he has become lazy and has lost his sense of ownership. Unquestionably, all this has taken place but, speaking frankly, to the same extent as in other economic sectors, from small plants to outer space.

It has been known ever since Marx's time that the productivity of farm labor has a decisive influence on any society. This concept is equally relevant today. But what happens actually? Seventy percent of the total amount of work in agriculture involves hard manual labor. It is no accident that the per capita power facilities available to our farmers average 35 hp, compared to 140 hp per American farmer. It is legitimate, therefore, with such a base that for the time being both cost accounting and leasing or any other forms of farming function poorly.

The administrative-pressure system, which does not take into consideration economic laws and does not ensure proper competence in the management of this important

sector, remains a major obstruction. No one would conceive of advising a surgeon how to operate; in agriculture, however, in the agrarian economy, everyone considers himself a major specialist. Here, in the halls of this congress we agrarians gathered during an intermission, to exchange views. A deputy unfamiliar to me asked to speak and began to give advice on most complex agricultural problems. We found out very quickly that he was a leading specialist in the field of design.

Naturally, the agrarian sector suffers from numerous shortcomings and from negligence. The outlay mechanism and elements of dependency are still alive. All of this does exist. However, the problem lies elsewhere. We do not know of any other country in the world which could feed its population without creating a favorable, I emphasize favorable, attitude toward the peasant, which would not engage in systematically solving the problems of agrarian policy. For example, decisions to change material and technical supplies and to make them part of the USSR Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply] system are being made without seeking any advice from the peasant or the farm manager. It is claimed that this is being done to help agriculture. But comrades, today we know the way agriculture is being supplied by such materials and equipment through the USSR Gossnab system. Not even ordinary paint can be bought. How could such an important national economic complex be left without a material supply system? The picture which indeed obtains is the following: All agrarians unanimously object, while others try to convince us that this will make it better for us. Whoever accepted such concepts and what they are based on no one can explain. Above all, there is no one responsible for such decisions.

Now, according to the resolutions of the March 1989 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, we have come to the crossroads of economic relations in the countryside. This was a timely, a necessary step. Naturally, all of this cannot be described as radical measures to improve agriculture. On this level, many of those who work in the agroindustrial complex feel an inner dissatisfaction with the steps which were formulated at the Central Committee Plenum. In my view, no radical forward steps were taken and, once again, everything is being reduced to half-way measures. Let us introduce leasing, it is said, and matters will improve, we shall create peasant farming system and ensure a substantial increase in food resources.

Unquestionably, there will be some increase. Already now, however, in order to satisfy market demand, we must increase food resources by a minimum of 30 billion rubles' worth. This is no more and no less than one-sixth of what is available. In this case, as the saying goes, we should double or triple the rpms.

How do we see the solution to this impasse? I believe that we need a serious reorientation of the entire national economy in favor of the accelerated development of the material and technical base of the countryside and its infrastructure. It is entirely understandable that this is no simple step, for we shall have substantially to curtail programs affecting other national economic complexes. We may have to reduce expenditures for defense and other projects. Also inevitable will be the organized resettlement of the able-bodied population from the towns into areas where the population has lost the capacity for self-reproduction. There is simply no other way.

Every citizen in our country must clearly realize that agriculture is today the backbone of the economy of the entire society. Perhaps it would be worth to have a national referendum on the formulation of radical ways for agricultural upsurge. I believe that the people would show a great deal of understanding for such a step and will not stand aside in the solution of such most difficult problems.

You must understand, comrades, that this step must be taken. Otherwise, the difficult situation with food supplies will bring about unpredictable social tension.

The next feature: We lack a clear concept consistent with the economic laws governing the development of society. Unfortunately, for some reason this is not being mentioned, although this is precisely both the reason for and the key to the solution of many problems. One of the Baltic deputies expressed what is in my view a very important thought: Interest is the basis of everything. This is a concept which Marx himself formulated but, unfortunately, which has now been forgotten. The city gives the country unsuitable equipment the prices of which are growing unrestrainedly. Industrial monopoly is becoming the Moloch which is ruining the countryside.

Unfortunately, this state of affairs continued even after the March party central committee plenum. This year, state centralized capital investments and budget appropriations for their financing, totaling 540 million rubles, were transferred from the Agricultural Committee for the Nonchernozem to the development of other sectors of the Soviet national economy. Long-term credits totaling 630 million rubles less than last year were appropriated in 1989 for the farms in the nonchernozem zone, along with short-term loans totaling 2.65 billion rubles. This is a total of 3.28 billion rubles. The USSR Council of Ministers passed a resolution on paying the farms' interest owed to the bank on loans the repayment of which was postponed on the basis of separate governmental resolutions, ranging from 1 to 5 percent, which will increase the costs to the farms in the nonchernozem zone by an additional 211 million rubles. Starting with 1 April of this year, the interest rate for the use of short-term loans was set at 15 percent instead of the previous 1.2-3.0 percent. Other documents were also passed, which obviously conflict with the resolution of the March CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

Here is yet another deputy question: By Resolution No 25 of 5 May 1989 on improving (what a blasphemous word!) the country's economy in 1989, the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] removed from the agro-industrial sector 20,000 tractors, 10,000 trucks, 1,100 excavators, and 1,677 bulldozers, which were subsequently delivered to Tsentrosoyuz for sale to the cooperatives. Comrade farm managers, who are sitting in this hall, we have dreamed for years of tractors and bulldozers and have been unable to obtain them. Now, apparently, we shall not obtain them at all.

Comrade deputies, what is happening? The polarization between the interests of town and country is increasing. Group egotism is growing. This was manifested quite rapidly after the laws on the state enterprise and the cooperative were passed. It was precisely during that period that prices jumped incredibly. Why so? Socialism calls for bringing urban interests closer to those of the country. A variety of ways to obtain this objective exists. One of them is to improve commodity-monetary and market relations. If we take this path, we must develop profoundly and comprehensively the mechanism for combining the interests of the city with that of the countryside. This pertains above all to investment policy, economics, price setting, and crediting. The impression is created that someone simply wishes to spoil relations between the working class and the peasantry.

Finally, we must accept the simple truth: Combining interests is the foundation for success. "A society in which a class difference remains between worker and peasant is neither communist nor socialist," Vladimir Ilich Lenin wrote ("*Poln. Sobr. Soch.*" [Complete Collected Works], vol 38, p 353).

Nor do we have a firm concept on the further development of kolkhoz-sovkhoz [state farm] production. Appeals to abolish the kolkhoz system have been sounded in periodicals, television programs, and even from the rostrum of this congress. It is being accused of failure to feed the people. Name one peasantry in a single country which would be able to withstand such a pressure for elimination. The countryside has been treated as a colony. The peasant was deprived of juridical, social, and economic rights. A great deal of this remains to this day. The fact that kolkhozes have survived this situation proves, yet once again, the great vital force of this system. (Applause).

What could one say today to the opponents of kolkhozes? You would like to strike a final blow at the peasant and thus condemn the people to semi-hungry rations for many long years. Yes, we have learned how to destroy. But how are we to build the peasant farms? Where to find the billions of rubles? Where to find the type of peasant who would like to work without adequate mechanization facilities, from dawn to dawn? There is also a further difficulty: The link between peasant generations has been broken and its restoration will take decades.

Comrades! The agrarian deputies submit the following to the congress:

Measures must be formulated to limit the monopoly of departments and gigantic plants;

The debts of kolkhozes and sovkhozes, caused by price increases and other arbitrary decisions, must be written off;

State orders must be reduced to the 25-30 percent level;

Economically set prices of produce must be established for all farms;

The quality of land must be assessed and fair taxes levied on this basis;

Rural homes must be provided with natural gas and electric power on an equal basis as the towns and at equal rates.

We suggest that a permanent authority—a committee on agrarian problems—be set up by the USSR Supreme Soviet, to defend the interests of the Soviet peasant, a committee which should report directly to the congress and be absolutely independent of departments. (Applause). Naturally, it is very important for the responsibility for such a complex program and problem to be assumed by the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. (Applause).

Comrades, the Congress of People's Deputies of the country is an entirely new phenomenon in our life. The entire course of the electoral campaign and its political relevance and high degree of activeness in which it took place generated in the people tremendous hope for this congress. Indeed, this forum is the culminating aspect of democratization of society. If we are able to find a way to solve urgent problems, we shall advance. If we fail to do so, we would doom the country not simply to stagnation but to faster lagging. The people, however, would not forgive us for this. (Applause).

I ask the chair to allow a few minutes for an address to the congress. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Do go on, comrades. You will allot time, yes?

From the hall: Yes.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Does the congress agree? Can we have more time?

From the hall: Yes.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Please, proceed.

V.A. Gontar, chairman of the Shlyakh do Kommunizmu Kolkhoz, Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], Cherkassy Oblast, Chernobayevskiy Rayon, Novoukrainka Village (representing kolkhozes united within the Union Council of Kolkhozes): Dear Mikhail Sergeyevich! Dear people's deputies! On behalf and on the instruction of the 417 agrarian deputies, I ask to be allowed to read an address to the congress.

Address to the USSR Congress of People's Deputies:

To you, the representatives of the people, we turn today with pain and concern. The people of our country have become infinitely tired of empty shelves, endless scarcity, and lines. Under our very eyes, on the 45th year of peaceful life, a rationing system is making its way.

The food problem has become the main yardstick of restructuring. The people rate us on the basis of what they have on their tables. On behalf of those who grow the grain, who love the land, we demand of you, the people's deputies the following: Commit the country's leadership to truly giving priority to the problem of the countryside in the political life of society and thus allow the people to feed themselves. (Applause). Not 10 years hence, but right now.

How to do this? Listen to us, the peasants, and understand and help the countryside. If it is bad for the peasant it is bad for the country. This has been confirmed by the entire experience of both world and domestic history. For many decades everything, to the last drop, has been extracted from the countryside. So far, the March 1989 CPSU Central Committee Plenum has not yielded expected results.

The peasant who is a respected and prestigious figure throughout the world, remains so far in our country a lower category person in terms of pensions, supplies, and living conditions. The desertion of the countryside is continuing. The land is getting poorer and billions in investments are yielding no returns.

The reasons for this are numerous. To this day the life of the peasant is worse than that of the urban resident, even despite his income from his private plot. His life span is shorter than that of the urban resident. The state provides the urban resident with a free apartment with all conveniences, while the peasant must build his own home at his own expense and with his own hands, cut his wood, draw and heat his own water, and procure his own produce. Everything in the countryside is worse: education, medicine, culture, and consumer services. (Applause).

For a number of years the departments, which were wrecking the countryside with their management, have taken even brides away from rural grooms, by destroying the industries and small enterprises which gave jobs to women.

To this day supplies to the villages are based on the residual principle. The villages are supplied with low-grade metal and equipment. How long will this go on? Why do the consumers of agricultural commodities think that the countryside should tolerate this?

As in the past, the peasant does not own the land. The production structure, volume, and state orders are determined from above through a policy of monopoly prices. Under such circumstances the government finds nothing better than to lower capital investments in the development of agriculture. It is revising national economic ratios under a scarcity of food products improperly, mistakenly.

We urgently demand the immediate and sharp turning of the country's economy around, such as to face the needs of the countryside, starting with the present congress. In the next few years the living standards in the country must be raised to a level close to that of the towns. The continuing large-scale industrial construction, defense expenditures, space, and other prestige projects must be sharply curtailed; the further expansion of the cities must be halted and an end must be put to the urbanization of the country. The thus released funds, materials, and manpower must be channeled into improving peasant housing and farms, roads, schools, hospitals, and the entire social area. It is not the peasants alone who must deal with this but this should be accomplished primarily with budget funds. Pensions and social security for all categories of rural workers and urban residents must be guaranteed and equalized. The workloads of the rural teacher, physician, and other categories of working people in the countryside must be revised. The villages must be supplied with natural gas, water, heat, and electric power as good as those of the towns and for the same rates. Supplies to the countryside of all the necessary goods should be no worse than in the cities.

Probably in no other country in the world is there such a gap between the prices of agricultural and industrial commodities, to the detriment of the countryside. In no civilized country is peasant labor valued so low. The prices of resources coming from the cities are increasing with every passing year while the quality of the equipment is declining. It is not astounding that the peasantry is unable to get rid of its debts. We work and work and then the industrial ministry, with the favorable neutrality of the USSR State Committee for Prices, hits us with the next price increase and, once again, the muzhik is in debt up to his ears. (Applause).

At this congress, we are now suggesting that instructions be issued to formulate steps to limit the monopoly status of departments and huge plants. We suggest that the debts caused by price increases and other arbitrary exaggerations to be written off the kolkhozes and sovkhozes. (Applause). In any case, the countryside will be unable to repay them and the lessee will not assume them.

We suggest that the production of contemporary agricultural machinery, equipment and tools be organized at defense plants, so that the call of "beating swords into plowshares" be indeed implemented. (Applause). Construction organizations and enterprises for the production of construction materials working for the countryside must be created immediately and ubiquitously. A considerable share of the urban construction potential should be channeled into the countryside.

For many years the villages were ordered around arbitrarily, even by nonprofessionals. The feeling of ownership has long been beaten out of the peasant. Today it has become easier. Nonetheless, the rural labor collective has no right to handle the produce it grows. Virtually everything is taken away from kolkhozes and sovkhozes on the basis of state orders, all the produce that can be sold. As in the past, the plan is based on the level reached. It is those who make better use of their opportunities that particularly suffer from this.

We suggest that state orders be substantially reduced and placed strictly on the basis of mutually acceptable contractual conditions. We must establish in principle uniform prices of goods by large area of specialization, applicable to all farms. We must knowledgeably assess the quality of the land and, on this basis, levy fair taxes. A land inventory must be taken throughout the country. The land must be taken away from bankrupt enterprises and given to the local soviets, and let them, on the basis of competition, give the land to kolkhozes, sovkhozes, lessees, cooperatives, peasant families, and farmers. We reject the incompetent leadership of agriculture and demand that it be conducted on a strictly scientific and democratic basis, that the role of science be increased and that modern scientific material and technical facilities be created.

We reject any interference from above or from the side in defining the forms of farming and demand the strict observance of the Leninist principle that no one should dare to order the peasant! (Applause.) Whereas in the past criminal coercion was applied, today it would be unreasonable to decide where and how should the peasant live.

We reject the slogan of dismantling kolkhozes and of restraining the leasing movement. We believe that under the conditions of our country kolkhozes, state farms, cooperatives, and peasant farms could and should exist. Let them compete on the basis of a strictly observed legal and economic equality. It is the peasant alone who must make such decisions. (Applause).

We demand a radical land reform—a Law on the Land—and a real variety of forms of ownership and farming.

We suggest that a permanent authority under the Supreme Soviet—a Committee on Agrarian Problems—consisting of USSR people's deputies, be set up to protect the interests of the peasantry, with its own system, independent of other departments, maintained by the kolkhozes and sovkhozes which will be answerable to the committee only. The Committee on Agrarian Problems should report exclusively to the Supreme Soviet, and no authorities and departments could make any decisions affecting agriculture and the condition of the peasantry without its agreement. (Applause). The committee should have the right to initiate legislation.

Actually, all of our suggestions may be reduced to a single thing: Peasant work must become the most prestigious and respected, as it is in all developed countries in the world. (Applause). The peasant must assume a worthy status in our society. It is in the interest of the entire society for the state to change its attitude toward the peasantry as a class. The peasantry must become the equal of workers and employees, economically, socially, and legally, with no exception, as stipulated in the USSR Constitution.

We request that our appeal be considered a draft resolution of the congress on agrarian problems. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Comrades, the following motion has been made: The presidium should consider this appeal and, after the session, suggest in what way, how to work with this document, and what instructions to be submitted to the congress.

Let us pursue our debates. Comrade Vladimir Ivanovich Kolesnikov, department head at the Rostov Institute of Railroad Transportation Engineers, Territorial District No 268, has the floor. The next speaker will be Comrade Nishanov.

V.I. Kolesnikov, department head, Rostov Institute of Railroad Transportation Engineers, Rostov-na-Donu (Oktyabrskiy Territorial Electoral District, RSFSR): Dear comrade deputies, I consider the importance of this congress in the fact that, for the first time in our history, it raises the question not only of the fact that a person must work, incidentally, we have been raising this question for the past 70 years, but of the sake for which he should work and who should benefit from the results of his labor.

Today we are going back to the slogan of the October Revolution, "All power to the soviets!" However, we must remember that Lenin combined this slogan with two other: "Land to the peasant!" and "Plants and factories to the workers!" However, we did not carry out in full the behests of the October revolution, for the command-administrative system deprived the people of power and ownership. Let me start with the following example:

We, deputies from Rostov Oblast, were instructed by the voters to raise the question of guaranteeing the safety of the Rostov nuclear power plant, built on the coast of the Tsimlyan Sea, on loose soil. I believe that this problem affects not only the people of Rostov. We have submitted

to the Presidium of this congress tens of thousands of written appeals by our voters on this matter. We are amazed that that the USSR Council of Ministers has shown no concern for this problem. We understand that the problems of the power industry must be dealt with by the state. However, they must be solved in a statesmanlike fashion.

To begin with, the population must be confident of the safety of the nuclear power plant on the basis of nondepartmental expertise. Second, its economic expediency must be proved. It is only then that, together with the people, the question of starting it should be settled.

It seems to me that these facts are related not only to the building of nuclear power plants but also that other plants as well would not exist had the local soviet been the true master of its territory. That is why the primary, the very first task of the congress should be to establish the mechanism for transfer of power to the soviets. We, the people's deputies, must formulate this mechanism. Furthermore, today the local system of soviets is not given material support. What is the solution to this situation? It is for the industrial enterprises to lease the land and the natural, manpower, and other resources form the local soviets. In such a case the enterprises will have to discuss with the local soviets the conditions under which they will operate on its territory. In my view, the task of the people's deputies here is to formulate a mechanism for withholdings for the local budget and to ratify it with a law.

The question that arises is how to combine the slogan of "All power to the soviets!" with those of "The land to the peasant!" and "The plants and factories to the worker!?" In the course of the debates here it was already pointed out the way managers of enterprises and chairmen of executive committees go to Moscow making the rounds hat in hand, asking for money and materials. Let me merely add to this that the faultiness of this system lies also in the fact that sometimes those display greater shrewdness are more successful than those who work better.

Today we must clearly realize that as long as we, as the legislative authority, have not drafted the laws according to which the true masters of the land and the enterprises will be those who work on and in them, we shall be unable to solve a single economic problem. Understandably, the solution of such problems is also related to social tasks: housing, transportation, pensions, medical services, science, education, etc. Furthermore, I am convinced that by solving social problems we shall also greatly ease national tension. All of this is, unquestionably, important and necessary. However, comrade deputies, I would like to draw your attention to the following feature: The moment we have made the soviets the real local power, we could anticipate manifestations of parochialism and attempts at tearing our state apart. In that case the role of the people's deputies will be to prevent this, to be able to rise above local interests, however important they may be.

In my view, a more difficult problem is that of transferring ownership of the enterprises to the working people. We know that some labor collectives, which have already been given independence, have taken the path of increasing their wages without increasing profits, and instead of upgrading labor productivity and mastering the new technology. As a result, we are not getting any richer but merely encouraging inflation and increasing the prices of goods. What is the solution? In my view the solution rests in the need to settle the question of transferring the power to the soviets and giving enterprises autonomy, as closely related to the questions of ownership in its various aspects as possible. Such ownership must be sacred and inviolable. Only in that case could we bring the working person closer to the land, the means of production and the results of his toil.

Comrades, everything seems to indicate that this is a fundamental, a Union problem which we cannot resolve on the level of the plant shop, as has been suggested here by some deputies. This problem must be solved above all at our fora, using to this effect the entire intellectual and, let me emphasize, the civic potential of the country. Furthermore, we also need caution, daring, and resolve as well as legal foundations for the work of the people's deputy, i.e., for his status.

I second the suggestion of many deputies on setting up a commission of people's deputies to draft this status. However, I also favor the formulation of a regulation on relations between the people's deputy and the Supreme Soviet and its commissions; between the people's deputy and ministries, departments, and officials; and between the people's deputy and the party authorities. In the past everything was simple. The Supreme Soviet was an authority directly elected by the people. Now the people have elected people's deputies. There is no power higher than the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. The Supreme Soviet means supremacy. Over what and over whom? Is this accurate? I am confident that in the future we will develop a mechanism for the implementation of the principle which will ensure the maximal manifestation of the will of the people—that is, a principle according to which the power of the deputy has been granted directly by the people and not delegated to anyone. This is natural.

We are all learning and improving ourselves, and the questions we are facing are numerous. This involves rotation in the Supreme Soviet, consensus vote, in which the manifestation of the aggressiveness of a majority or a minority is excluded, the possibility of which we have repeatedly realized in this hall. It also involves the mechanism for convening an extraordinary congress both from above, by the Supreme Soviet, as well as from below, on the demand of the deputies. This also includes the right to deny the government a vote of confidence.

Another major question is drafting a Law on Elections. Elections for republic and soviets are not too far off and we do not know today entirely how to conduct this

campaign. I am in favor of elections on an alternative basis, elections after which even this congress will feel the voters breathing down its neck. In this case as well I am deeply convinced that if all elections are of this nature, there would be a greater reciprocal understanding in our own congress. (Applause). I believe that we must eliminate pre-electoral district meetings, for they limit the expression of the will of the voters. (Applause). I believe that candidates nominated by public organization should be elected by the population as a general principle, based on territorial features and alternate choices. (Applause).

I am against factions and favor bringing together the deputies on the basis of certain problems, regardless of their delegations. We know that full unity means stagnation, something which we have already seen. We are not as yet fully acquainted with each other and we have been separated into territorial groups. Yet, I am convinced, that our task is for the deputies to abandon the geographic and land origin principle and to choose for themselves a problem and rally on the basis of the common problems they will have to deal with. (Applause).

When I speak of the problems of the deputies, I link them to the views of the electorate. In the future, therefore, when our parliament will be equipped with technical facilities, we must not reject the the roll-call vote system. The voters must know what their deputy is voting for and what laws he is proposing. And for the deputy to be able to propose such laws, a system must exist for submitting and discussing draft bills. The main thing here is not to exclude any options and to be specific: The people must know who the author or groups of authors of one law or another is, and at that point there would be no question of who could possibly be the author of Article 11.1. Who is the author of the Ukase on demonstrations and meetings? This is quite important. It would make it possible, in drafting a bill, to be particularly cautious, watchful, and responsible. Let me bluntly say that my electorate has instructed me to support the deletion of Article 11.1. I too support Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's suggestion that the most important laws must be passed on the basis of nationwide referenda.

My voters would like a public answer to the following: Why is it that out of the three deputies sent by the million-strong population of Rostov-na-Donu one of them is a member of the Supreme Soviet, and how do I feel about this? I consider this a basic question, for which reason I shall answer it. When the congress passed the resolution on the nomination of candidacies for the Supreme Soviet by territorial groups of deputies, I suggested Deputy Vladimir Yakovlevich Shevlyuga, a Rostselmash worker. As a result of the open vote, however, the 19 deputies from Rostov Oblast nominated other representatives. I basically consider that the electoral system is imperfect and that instead of having elections, as the USSR Constitution stipulates, we are essentially delegating deputies from our group, although the people elected independent deputies and not delegates.

Comrades, let me mention yet another problem which affects all of us. It is the problems AIDS. We know about its outbreak in the city of Elista. Now there is also AIDS in Rostov and in Volgograd. But when will our hospitals be supplied with disposable syringes? I suggest that a group of deputies who are medical workers be set up to resolve this very important state problem.

Comrade deputies, finally, I would like to draw your attention to a problem which is of vital importance and of prime significance in all areas and sectors of the national economy, a problem whose importance will grow in the future: that of transportation, including by rail. The deputy railroad workers have asked the USSR Council of Ministers to report on the steps planned by the Soviet government on the further development of railroad transportation. I thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Thank you. The next speaker is Comrade Rafik Nishanovich Nishanov, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee.

R.N. Nishanov, first secretary, Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, Tashkent (Leningradskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Uzbek SSR): Dear comrade deputies, our congress can be considered with full justification the congress of the peoples of the Soviet Union. The virtually entire country, all Soviet people, are participating in its work. There is absolutely no question that it will implement its historical role of providing a new impetus to the further democratic transformation of socialism and formulate ways of solving urgent problems.

As to problems, we have more than enough. The speech by Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev dealt in substantial detail with the course of restructuring, changes, errors, and obstacles on the way to its implementation, and primary tasks.

All of us, dear comrades, see that irreversible steps have been taken on the path of restructuring. We have been able to turn society from stagnation to motion, from dogmatism to realism, and to restoring the Leninist approaches and Leninist views of social development. The people expect and demand of restructuring real results. Such results, however, will come about only if the foundations of popular rule and law and order are firmly strengthened and if we can totally reject the command-bureaucratic management methods.

In my view, as a whole, a constructive and practical discussion on such problems is taking place at the congress. I am distressed, however, by isolated bursts

and shameless labeling and classifying deputies into progressive and conservative, and the efforts on the part of individual comrades to set the congress against the party workers.

Yesterday, for example, an attack was mounted against the institution of second secretaries. All of this does not contribute to our consolidation but destroys our unity. Individual deputies contaminated, I would say, by the bacillus of arrogance, have allowed themselves to launch insulting sallies against deputies representing Central Asian republics, indiscriminately accusing them of obediently following some kind of orders and instructions. We firmly reject such sallies. (Applause).

Dear comrades, we do not have first-class or second-class deputies. We do not have very responsible or irresponsible deputies any more than we have broad-minded and narrow-minded deputies. All of us are equal and equally responsible to our own electorate and to the country. I believe that we all need a very calm, and reciprocal patient, considered, and competent interpretation of processes and a choice of proper directions and ways of progress, and the consolidation of all groups and all regions, for we are engaged in the pursuit of a common cause. We live with the concerns of the country and the congress, with the concerns of the people. I and my party fellow-workers, like many participants in the congress, are quite seriously concerned, for example, by problems of drafting legal and legislative acts. We know that a building rests on its foundations. A thoroughly developed mechanism for democracy, and profoundly considered laws must become the foundation without which a rule of law state is inconceivable. Some 150 years ago Vissarion Grigoryevich Belinskiy noted that our country needs not sermons but sensible laws and their strictest possible observance. Yet, for the time being we still do not have a thoroughly developed technology for lawmaking and a procedure for the formulation, discussion, and passing of laws. Some laws, passed of late, are not working as was intended; others develop accretions which reduce their meaning to naught; others again have revealed the controversial nature of some concepts immediately after their promulgation. The authorities and the law must watch over the interests of society, the interests of the people. This was well put in the report.

Problems of relations between the center and the republics require legislative codification as well. As we know, the 1924 Soviet Constitution, which was drafted with the participation of Vladimir Ilich Lenin, included the title "On the Sovereign Rights of Union Republics and On Union Citizenship." The 1936 Constitution, like the current one, does not include such a title. The lack of a legislative stipulation has led to the fact that in the 1940s entire peoples, including the Crimean Tatars, the Meskhet Turks, and others were deprived of their native land and, until recently, any mention of the need to take into consideration the national features and normal patriotic concern for the development of the native language and true national culture was frequently identified with nationalism which, as was accurately mentioned in the report, triggered feelings of bitter hurt and was rather painfully reflected on national self-awareness. (Applause).

I believe it entirely justified if in the drafting of the new Soviet Constitution this title is restored, naturally in accordance with the new requirements. The time has also come to legislatively codify the rights of small ethnic groups as we consider, for example, the concept of a Law on National Groups. (Applause).

Restructuring brought to light a number of sharp and neglected ills in the republics. Yet the events which have taken place in recent years in a number of areas have clearly indicated how far unsolved problems could lead us. The sources of such manifestations may be different but in their majority they are closely related to distortions in national policy in previous decades, gross distortions and exaggerations in economic development, and neglect of the social and cultural areas. The party organization and all working people of Uzbekistan were left a difficult legacy from the period of stagnation. Gross errors and distortions were committed in party and ideological work. There were disproportions in industry and agriculture. A moral decline and the corruption of a number of leading personnel, who are now under party and criminal indictment, were detected. The Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee Buro is engaged in a decisive struggle against corrupt elements of all kinds, and such work will be carried out to its completion. The solution of all such and other radical problems has initiated the practical implementation of the complex process of restructuring which is taking place in the Republic in the course of the difficult struggle between the old and the new, the difficult elimination of existing stereotypes and dogmas, and the difficult mastery of new styles and methods of work and new way of thinking. All of us are learning the restructuring approaches to economic, social, and political problems. This too is not easy to achieve. The structure of public production on the sectorial and territorial levels has been disrupted in the Republic. For many years its development took place essentially without control, and one-sidedly. For many long years the emphasis was on the development of sectors oriented toward the production of raw materials and semi-finished goods, the share of which reached 60 percent in the overall volume of output. Production facilities with an insignificant number of new jobs and a low share of wages in production costs were created at an insanely accelerated pace. This worsened the already grave problem of employment and hindered the growth of the population's monetary income. Huge funds were wasted on the building of extremely big complexes for the extraction and primary processing of raw materials, including for the chemical and petrochemical industries and nonferrous metallurgy, which consume substantial

amounts of water, which is scarce under our circumstances, and which seriously affects the ecological situation. Meanwhile, capacities for the production of finished goods and processing agricultural commodities were virtually not developed. But is it admissible for us to process no more than 10 percent of the cotton grown in the Republic? This single crop, inflated to monstrous volumes, became not only a hindrance but the real calamity of our entire area, resulting in the exhaustion of land and water resources, excessively high chemicalization of fields, and mass diseases among the population. As was already said here, the Aral is a clear example of this. Currently, with the help of the Union authorities, we have been able somewhat to reduce the areas in cotton and to expand the areas in fodder crops and fruits, vegetables, and vineyards. However, in order to put a final and total end to the grossest possible distortions and arbitrariness in cotton growing and, therefore, increase the production of foodstuffs, both we and the Union authorities will have to consider further steps to reduce the amounts of cotton and reduce it to the level of the real needs of our country. (Applause).

The growing of cotton, dear comrades, is a most difficult and exhausting type of work which demands tremendous physical and moral efforts. I think that we are still using the cotton quite wastefully. We think little about replacing it with chemical fibers, something which has long been practiced abroad. Judge for yourselves, comrade deputies: Of the total amount of cotton produced in the Soviet Union, approximately 2.5 million tons, or nearly 700,000-800,000 tons, are exported while the rest is kept for domestic consumption. We have the virtually highest use of cotton for industrial purposes in the world, 14 percent, compared to 3 percent in Japan and even less than 1 percent in the United States. In the Soviet Union the production of cotton fabrics per capita is more than double that of other countries; meanwhile, the share of chemical staples in the overall volume of its consumption is the lowest—under 30 percent—which is one half to one third less than in the FRG, Italy, and Japan. We can supply our friends in the socialist community as much cotton as they may require for their own needs.

All of this, dear comrades, urgently calls for developing a scientific Union-wide "Cotton" Program, which would take into consideration the actual needs of the country for cotton staple and which would make it possible firmly to change the production specialization and structure of crops in favor of solving, above all, the food problem. On this matter we agree with the leadership of the USSR Gosplan and I believe that we shall be able to formulate such a program.

Comrade deputies, let me note, in conclusion, that on the eve of our congress a number of events of international significance took place. One of the most outstanding among them was Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's trip to the PRC. Our large-scale foreign policy action was successful and a beginning was laid to a new era of reciprocal relations between the two great nations—the Soviet and the Chinese. We fully support the foreign policy course charted by our party's Central Committee and all of us are ready to contribute our own efforts in this direction. I thank you very much for your attention. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Deputy Gorbunov has the floor.

A.V. Gorbunov, chairman of the Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet (Tsesisskiy Territorial Electoral District, Latvian SSR): Dear chairman, dear comrade deputies. One of the most difficult problems in the restructuring and democratization of the Soviet political system is its legal support. However, this clashes with obsolete laws whenever efforts are made to carry out radical changes in a given area. In short, a paradoxical situation develops. One may work inefficiently but in accordance with obviously obsolete norms of the current law. One could passively wait for the new USSR Constitution. It will take more than a year before it can be completed. In that area as well we must truly not be in a hurry. However, there is also another way: tirelessly to advance restructuring and, at the same time, take more decisive timely steps in the legislative area. It is true that we heard here, at the congress, claims that we will not be understood unless we start immediately to introduce amendments to the USSR Constitution.

The Latvian deputies are of a different opinion. Our electorate will not understand if the congress, after working for 2 weeks, fails to introduce a single amendment to the USSR Constitution, even if only in articles which are clearly hindering progress today such as, for example, the development of our federation in the interest of a qualitatively new political and economic sovereignty of Union republics. (Applause). The Republic's legislators are actively making new laws, without which the further democratization of our political system and the legislative solution of still existing problems are impossible.

I am deeply convinced that today we cannot work while constantly facing obsolete Union laws; nor can we agree at all with stagnation requirements according to which the accuracy of the new legal norms should fully coincide with the obsolete stipulations of the Constitution. Therefore, on behalf of the group of deputies of Soviet Latvia, I submit to the consideration of the congress a draft USSR Law on Constitutional Amendments. We are suggesting amendments which apply to what we consider no more than a few essential articles. We ask the congress to set up a commission of competent jurists and deputies representing all republics to formulate the final drafts.

Now, as to the essence of our proposals: They are aimed at restoring the sovereignty of Union Soviet socialist republics. Only a few years ago the problems of granting state sovereignty to Union republics seemed infinitely distant to many citizens and totally unrelated to their daily life and concerns. Now everything has changed. No one is asked any more to prove that restoring the

sovereignty of Union republics and the search for an optimal interrelationship among republics and between the Union and the individual republics requires not only the revision of the old dogmas and the understanding of the new situation but also taking entirely specific practical steps.

Let us consider the economy of the Latvian SSR. A number of examples could be cited of unjustified management centralization leading to a total inconsistency between some production facilities and the interests of the republic in which they are located and their peoples for the satisfaction of whose needs they were created. For example, we are completely unable to explain to the Latvian population why, when the republic has four large enterprises for agricultural machine building, our peasants are not equipped with even the basics—a good plow or a sowing machine.

Excessive centralization and neglecting the national interests of Union republics, oblasts, and krays for decades have led to major distortions in their economic development. Thus, for example, the unjustified construction of large and extremely large enterprises, frequently regardless of economic and social consequences and despite lack of power, raw materials, and manpower, led to excessive and uncontrolled migration processes. This entailed not only catastrophic changes in the national and demographic structure of the population of a number of Union republics and oblasts but also to a worsening of the sociocultural infrastructure.

Let us add to this that the same type of deformations in the development of the Latvian national economy was the reason for a sharp worsening of the ecological situation and the decline in the 1970s and 1980s of the living standards and the health of the population. A threat to the future full development of national culture and science arose; the scope and use of the national language shrank. The existing situation demands urgent changes.

We must create an entirely new type of federation. Such was the instruction given to us by our voters. Naturally, in terms of its nature this is a revolutionary and extremely complex matter. An entire array of problems must be solved in a new and unusual fashion. The key among them, in our view, are the decisive decentralization of the Union by demarcating and reassigning rights in favor of Union republics, and establishing an efficient legal mechanism for the coordination of interests between the USSR and the Union republics.

Dear deputies, allow me to cite a few examples of the specific nature of our proposals. Let us begin with the fact that Article 76 of the USSR Constitution, which stipulates that a Union republic is a sovereign Soviet socialist state, clearly conflicts with other articles in that same Constitution. An example of this is Article 73, which interprets the competence of the USSR so loosely that virtually all rights could be interpreted as applicable on the federal level, as well as Article 74, according to which any Soviet law, even if it has been promulgated on problems pertaining exclusively to the competence of a Union republic, is legally superior to any law of a Union republic.

In order somehow to eliminate even this contradiction alone, we suggest that Article 74 be amended as follows: "The laws of the USSR on problems which are within the competence of the Union will have the same power on the territory of all Union republics." Furthermore, we believe that a sovereign state, such as a Union republic, should also have legal guarantees for this sovereignty, the right to ratify the USSR Constitution and its amendments in particular.

Let us now consider Article 174 which defines the procedure for amending the Constitution of the USSR by decision of the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR. It is formulated in such a way that even if all deputies of a Union republic in the USSR Congress of People's Deputies would vote against amendments and they would be rejected by the supreme legislator of the republic, the law on amending the USSR Constitution would nonetheless be enacted on the territory of all Union republics. The result, therefore, is that the conditions according to which, according to the Constitution there are "sovereign Soviet socialist states," i.e., Union republics, united within the USSR, could be amended not only without their agreement but even against their will.

Today one frequently hears views about centrifugal trends and accusations of separatism. Sometimes even the mention of words such as autonomy, sovereignty, and independence are immediately interpreted as appeals to withdraw from the USSR. I believe that in this area there are many misunderstandings and unnecessary suspicion or simply ignorance.

Nonetheless, what kind of independence are we discussing, and what do we mean by this term?

First, it means an acknowledgment of the fact that our state is constituted by sovereign Union republics, which have the right freely, without any outside pressure, to define their domestic and internal political status. Hence our motion of redrafting Article 70 of the USSR Constitution to read as follows: "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a Union multinational state formed on the basis of a Union treaty as a result of the voluntary unification of equal Soviet socialist republics. This unification is based on the principle of the free self-determination of nations."

Second, it means acknowledging the need for the reapportionment of state powers in such a way that Union republics could themselves, on their own territory, exercise full state power. (Applause). In this case we proceed from the fact that the Union republics are primary and

the federation is their resultant. The republics alone can grant to the Union or recover a specific right rather than vice versa, for it is the republics that made the Union. (Applause).

Third, a republic cannot be considered a sovereign state unless it has the right independently to handle its territory and resources. According to Article 11 of the USSR Constitution, the land, the soil, waters, forests, and basic means of production are the exclusive property of the state, i.e., the common property of the Soviet people. However, it is difficult to imagine the possible type of economic independence of a republic if constitutionally the land, the soil, water, timber, and any other resources created or located on the territory of a given republic has not been constitutionally codified as the property of the people of that same Union republic.

Fourth, and last, a sovereign state cannot be limited in its economic activities. In this connection, we appeal to the people's deputies of the USSR. The current Constitution gives us the right at this congress to pass laws on everything. But if we think about it, however, this clashes with the principle of the sovereignty of the republics. Let us hope that in their legislative activities both the USSR Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet will limit themselves to problems of federative relations, leaving the rest to the republic legislators. (Applause).

What conclusion can be drawn from all this? The conclusion is that one of the decisive aspects in the implementation of the Leninist ideas of Soviet federalism is respect for the right of nations to self-determination. Without this we cannot achieve reciprocal understanding and trust in our multinational Union state. We must not forget that sovereignty is the inalienable right of the people and the state. Let us behave toward this right sensibly and respectfully.

If we are to be honest, we must admit that occasionally we are short of displaying a sensible and respectful attitude. That precisely is the basis of the tension among nationalities in Latvia, which sometimes assumes a nationalistic or chauvinistic aspect. However much we may condemn such shameful phenomena, they will remain unless we eliminate the social roots of tension among nationalities.

Therefore, economic and political autonomy are not a self-seeking aim but a means of improving the living environments not only of the Latvian people but of the entire population in our Republic. In Latvia there is a uniform understanding of problems of economics, culture, and language. However, the ways to solve them are sometimes drastically different. Sometimes priority is given to subjective considerations of specific population groups.

In our hard-earned practice we proceed from the fact that national problems cannot be solved through referenda. They can be solved only through patient search and mutually acceptable decisions. For no single nation can be happy if its happiness is built on the misfortune of another. (Applause).

Therefore, the main question is how to seek such a mutual acceptance? Should it be through ultimata, strikes or a political dialogue based on mutual respect? The Latvian Communist Party Central Committee and the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet firmly stated both at the plenum and the session that political problems can be solved only through political means. (Applause).

We believe that the sovereignty of Latvia, allied with other republics, is consistent with the interests of people of all nationalities who have linked their destinies to the fate of our Republic. We shall observe this principle strictly. I thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Deputy Mutalibov has the floor.

A.N. Mutalibov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Azerbaijan SSR (Kubatlinskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Azerbaijan SSR): Dear Mikhail Sergeyevich! Dear comrade deputies. Hardly anyone today doubts that democratization and glasnost, which were born of restructuring, have become irreversible. This is confirmed by the entire atmosphere, the entire situation in which our congress is being held. The working people of Soviet Azerbaijan and the people's deputies in our delegation accepted the report submitted by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev as a thorough and self-critical analysis of accomplishments during the period of restructuring and as a program for our further joint work. Despite the difficult and rather complex problems which exist in the country, restructuring has set our society on the move. The question is only of the speed and efficiency with which it is moving, what should our attention be concentrated on in the immediate future, and with what we should begin. The problems which have accumulated in the country and in all its areas apply, to one extent or another, to Azerbaijan as well. Disproportions and the errors which were made in the past have created a stressed economic situation in the Republic. Inherent in Azerbaijan are a monopoly in agriculture, and an industry oriented toward the extraction of raw materials and the production and procurement of semi-finished goods. Consequently, in terms of per capita production the Republic has reached a quite high indicator. Nonetheless, in terms of problems of social insurance or, more accurately, of anything which defines the living standard of the people, we have fallen seriously behind the average Union indicators which, as I understand it, no longer satisfy the Soviet people.

Naturally, this type of economic structure does not ensure today the solution of the most topical, the most vital problems related, in particular, to the production of consumer goods and a wide range of services. This causes an imbalance in monetary circulation and other negative phenomena.

Such a social background demanded of us the formulation and taking of efficient steps and nonstandard decisions. This is helped by the restructuring taking place in the country. I do not wish to be accused of making self-serving reports, but, comrades, within a relatively short time a decisive turn has been taken in implementing tasks in the social area, which was the most lagging and most worrisome for the working people of Azerbaijan. For example, the volume of individual housing construction doubled and we intend to increase its pace. There has been activity in food supplies and medical services, and a program of computerization is being implemented, along with improving the structure of industrial production aimed at the development of sectors with the help of which we can solve problems of using the surplus manpower. Comrades, a struggle is being waged and is intensifying against corruption and the illegal economy and all types of crime. These are merely the first indications of restructuring, merely the beginning of the work.

We can reach higher standards only by efficiently mastering new economic management methods and implementing the measures suggested in Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report. We consider territorial cost accounting the shortest way to an upsurge in the Republic's production forces. That is why we fully support the line of broadening economic independence and increasing the sovereignty of Union republics. In this connection, I suggest that we speed up the formulation of the law on self-management and self-financing of Union republics and not to experiment but to master these principles as a whole in all republics, for all of them are interested in this.

I would also like to emphasize that the new system of economic interrelationships must not erode the principles of Soviet federalism but contribute to their strengthening. There can be no strong union republics without a strong center, and vice versa. Nonetheless, of late attempts have been made to apply the concept of regional cost accounting as a kind of screen to conceal autarchic trends. This is fraught with the danger of the disruption of economic relations among Union republics. Incidentally, let me point out that long before the conversion to territorial cost accounting, as planned for 1989, as you know, more than 50 percent of the output going into the national economy and its use were based on direct contracts. We have tremendous difficulties which can be expressed through the single concept of the diktat of labor collectives: I sign a contract if I want to and I do not if I do not want to. For that reason this very year industry is in a feverish state, in our Republic in particular. In all likelihood, this applies to other areas as well.

This must not be allowed under the conditions of a state structured on the basis of the principles of a voluntary alliance among sovereign republics, closely linked with economic and cultural ties, sharing a common history and a political system. The unified national economic complex is a tremendous accomplishment of the social system and, comrades, it should not go to waste. This is our view. Today integration processes are a common global trend. Can we ignore it?

Development is impossible without extensive equivalent exchange of goods. We acknowledge the need for sensible specialization and cooperation. However, we must not allow the one-sided development of the national economy of one republic or another, or its conversion to or use as a raw material appendage.

We must consider the right of the republics to market independently goods produced above the limit of state orders along with raw materials and production waste which can be used with a view to supplying the republic markets with consumer goods through trade. This will make it possible to reduce our appealing to the central authorities.

It may not have been necessary to mention this today if we had not felt in actual economic practices the aspiration of the center to direct the republics into self-support, on the one hand, and occasionally to increase the production of goods which distort the structure of the local economy, aggravate the ecological situation, and trigger an imbalance in monetary circulation, on the other.

Today we are trying to solve such problems relying on our own forces as well. We try to eliminate feelings of dependency. However, there also are problems in which we need the support of the center. In particular, this includes important matters, such as perfecting the structure of our republic's industry and creating new jobs because of the very grave demographic situation. In this connection, I use this opportunity to express my disagreement, for example, with the decision (however difficult the financial situation in the country may be today) to halt the building of a number of industrial enterprises, such as the plant for personal computers in Baku, the automotive plant in Kirovabad, where two-thirds of the capital investments have already been made, and the carpets combine in Nakhichevan, the construction of which is essentially completed. Such activities on the part of the central departments, which are in the spirit of administrative-command management methods, comrades, are unacceptable today.

The commissioning of these projects would make it possible, among others, to reduce the commodity shortage and provide jobs for tens of thousands of people. For in addition to the already employed population, we must provide jobs to another 65,000 able-bodied people among those who have come to our Republic as a result of the familiar events in the Armenian SSR. In this connection, we deem necessary to request of the new government to consider with great attention the problem of a labor surplus in the Republic, surplus which is the basic resource for the production forces in our country.

Comrade deputies, through joint efforts we must also solve the problem of the touchy aspects of relations among nationalities, including the problem of Nagornyy Karabakh. Although they may be quite specific, essentially they are typical of many parts of the country. They are based on the deformation which was allowed to occur in the past in the system of social relations and the fact that socioeconomic and moral-psychological problems remained unsolved. Such problems must be solved in a tranquil atmosphere and not through strikes, power pressure or violations of the sovereign rights of republics. The decree of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers on radically improving the situation in the NKAO called for the appropriation of substantial funds to this effect. Everything possible must be done to make use of this help. However, there still are many forces which, as they pursue their specific objectives, are blocking positive changes and preventing the elimination of ethnic confrontations.

It is time to draw a clear line between those who indeed are aspiring to an improvement in relations among nationalities and the socioeconomic transformation of this area, and those who do nothing but formulate territorial claims. They have already caused a great deal of trouble and harm! We believe, as was said by many people during the proceedings of this congress and, apparently, more will be said on the subject, that the laws must be strictly observed and applied in ensuring order, guaranteeing the security and the defense of all people wherever they may live and whatever their nationality. In his report the respected Mikhail Sergeyevich particularly emphasized this thought which we support entirely. Our voters demand that we turn from appeals to decisive action in the application of the laws which, incidentally, were passed by the Soviet people in defense of their interests.

Comrades, of late ecological problems have assumed particular gravity. We too are particularly affected by them. The authors of a motion picture which was recently shown on central television described Sumgait as a dead zone. Here chemical works have taken over from man and led the city into an ecological crisis. Many such cities exist both in our Republic and throughout the country. The situation which has developed in them is related to departmental egotism and scorn for the interests of man. Nonetheless, we must also point out that this is the result of the irresponsibility of the labor collectives themselves and their immediate superiors and all of us, comrades. A great deal has already been said on this subject and now specific action is needed!

We are doing a great deal of work which, incidentally, is monitored by our entire public. We are not following the path of confrontation with Union ministries or closing down chemically and ecologically harmful production facilities for, as I understand it, our country's national economy cannot do without them.

Let me cite as an example the interesting work which we have been doing of late with the managers of our ministries and the USSR Council of Ministers. Let me mention Comrade Vladimir Kuzmich Gusev, who has repeatedly come to our Republic to discuss such matters, and Comrade Ministers Bespalov and Olshanskiy. It is only in such unity that we see a solution to all problems which concern us.

Considering that problems of ecology are today holding the attention of the entire public, our delegation deems necessary to submit the motion of setting up within the USSR Supreme Soviet a special environmental protection commission.

Comrades, the solution of economic problems requires interregional integration. Take, for example, the question of the Caspian Sea, the cleanliness of which we can never achieve by ourselves, without cooperating with the various oblasts along the Volga, Daghestan, and the Kazakh and Turkmen SSRs. To this purpose we suggest the creation of a Caspian Institute, which could help us to join efforts.

Comrades, ensuring the population with food is problem number one. Its solution depends on a number of factors. I would like today to single out that of reclamation. An antireclamation mood has been growing in the country of late. Without excusing in the least the numerous distortions, I believe that today it is impossible to farm in a way guaranteed to block the influence of nature without reclamation.

Comrades, the restructuring under way in the country has drawn near yet another significant stage: the drafting of laws which define the rights of the USSR, Union republics, and autonomous formations. Can it be considered normal that out of the innumerable number of legal acts which regulate economic regulations it is only an insignificant part, literally isolated units, that are in the form of laws? This is by no means a formal feature, for in the absence of a law which has a supreme juridical force, we have regulations adopted by executive authorities—that is, by the same administrative apparatus.

Let me also mention our attitude toward improving the activities of the Council of Nationalities. Let me take one aspect. The question is raised for all problems relative to interrepublic and internationality relations which may be submitted to the Congress of People's Deputies for its consideration to be considered by the USSR Supreme Soviet. We believe that such problems must be mandatorily coordinated with the Union republics, particularly those which affect changing the borders, and establishing new autonomous formations. The decisions which are passed in such cases must be strictly based on Article 78 of the USSR Constitution. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: I ask the comrades to observe the rules. Here is another announcement: We receive here letters, some motions, and even questions. Deputies are asking when will the results of the vote on the NKAO be made public. I am hereby reporting that the Presidium intends to do this at the end of our morning session. This will be approximately at 1:40. Therefore, please have this in mind. Now Deputy Boris Ilich Oleynik, secretary of the board, Union of Writers of the Ukrainian SSR has the floor. The next speaker will be Comrade Zoya Pavlovna Pukhova.

B.I. Oleynik, poet, secretary of the board of the Ukrainian SSR Writers Union, Kiev (from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union): Dear chairman and comrade deputies, although I am speaking, as you have probably noticed, on behalf of the most humble and loyal Republic, I am not particularly shocked by the excited activeness and emotionalism of the deputies who, without waiting to be called by the chair, march on to the rostrum. We are merely beginning to learn democracy and the standards of parliamentarianism. Nonetheless, I have to point out that in the natural aspiration to prove their activeness to the electorate glued to their television screens, in the first days we primarily showed them not our inspired faces but, forgive me, our backs. I am touched to tears on the way trustingly, intimately opening up to the people's deputies and, consequently, to our entire domestic and global community, we literally leaned on the shoulder of the head of the state, obviously sharing with him our most intimate thoughts. (Laughter, applause).

This generosity of our character and simplicity of mores have been noted not only by the excited domestic viewer but also the foreign public, shaken up by such democracy. (Laughter). I address such observations above all to myself, comrades. For in my village, Zachepilovka, there has not been any consulate with its protocol department. Therefore, we are learning from each other.

Naturally, we would like to solve all problems immediately. I realize that everyone is answerable to his voters, who expect of us something real, and to let them down would be the equivalent of certifying to our own insolvency. However, in order not to disappoint them we should not deceive ourselves in trying hastily to solve all problems.

It would be worth to consider several specific problems and solve them here. Otherwise we would find it difficult to look our voters in the eyes. Here are, in my view, some of them.

Above all, we must find ways, even by eliminating some overall alluring programs, to add, albeit a little bit, to the wages and pensions of people who live below or on the line of poverty, in order not to burn with national shame. (Applause).

The biggest tangle of problems is in the area of nationalities. Let us firmly and frankly say that such tangles can be unraveled only by strictly professing the ideas of federalism, according to which each republic and it alone should be both the subject and the sovereign body in correcting the accumulated deformations. The solution of the linguistic problem in kindergartens, schools, PTU, technical colleges, and VUZs, in office work or science or, in short, in all material and spiritual structures, should be achieved in such a way that the language of the native nation not be like a subservient day worker but a first-class proud master of his native home. (Applause).

In short, I favor the model and idea of the Baltic republics, supported by the prime minister of Kazakhstan: Strong republics mean a strong center, for it is the roots that nourish the crown and not vice versa. Naturally, as we raise the national self-awareness—the sacred feeling of love for the history and laws of our ancestors—to the same extent we must develop within ourselves respect for all nations, for national isolation, as Oles Gonchar has pointed out, is the most terrible thing in this interrelated and interdependent world. However, formalism and equalization are absolutely unacceptable in such a sensitive area. Naturally, we also have common general difficulties and, at the same time, each republic has its own specific problems. For example, in the Ukraine and Belorussia the right of parents to choose the language in which their children will be educated is by no means all that ideal as it may be for other republics, perhaps for the fact alone that in some cities there simply is no choice, for there are no Belorussian and Ukrainian schools at all. In such exceptional cases, in addition to said parental rights we must also stipulate the right of nations to self-defense. For example, we favor granting the Ukrainian language the status of a state language, having emphasized that on such a state level we must contribute to the development of the languages of all nationalities living in the Ukraine. Naturally, this includes Russian, as the tried instrument of international communication.

Of late, however, and not without the participation of central television, the idea is being increasingly promoted of giving the Russian language the status of a state language, along with the national language. I believe that such a step would be a direct retreat from the initial idea which was supported by the overwhelming majority of republic voters. (Applause). In the final account, has anyone ever asked whether the Russians themselves want this? I am confident that the overwhelming majority of Russians will consider this an insulting mistrust in their powerful language which for many decades has been used voluntarily by the peoples of our country as a reliable bridge of brotherhood.

But is it not a paradox for the great Russian people themselves to be the worst harmed from the national aspect point of view, having neither their own communist party nor academy of sciences. Furthermore Russia

which, together with Belorussia and the Ukraine, endured just about the heaviest burden of the Great Patriotic War, is not even represented in the United Nations. (Applause).

As to the term "bilingualism" itself: If it is true that the language is the soul of the people, does it not seem to you that this combination of words deliberately leads to another less seemly one? (Applause). I would ask the government and the Politburo to pay attention to and make an example of punishing officials, particularly local ones, who are fiercely opposing restructuring in the area of relations among nationalities and are persecuting, to put it bluntly, the members of the Ukrainian Language Society imeni Taras Grigoryevich Shevchenko.

One should not immediately clutch at one's heart at the sight of an ancient symbol, shall we say in Tallinn or Lvov. For the sources which feed the river of popular history are not to be blamed if, along any part of that river, garbage has been thrown in it. The river must be cleaned, for it is precisely out of this river that future generations will satisfy their thirst for knowledge as to who are their fathers and whose children we are.

A problem directly related to strengthening the sovereignty of republics is that of protecting the habitat and defending it from the invasions of central departments which are building with impunity nuclear power plants, chemical monsters, and all sorts of canals wherever they deem fit. And since, as a rule, the departments present their unwanted gifts to humanized cultural and historical centers, which have been inhabited for centuries, such as Kiev, Chigirin, Kanev, Zaporozhye, Rovno, and Khmelnitskiy, and since such mines are being laid not only under national holies but also under the entire republic, the struggle against these newly hatched industrial aggressors emerges on the forefront. Indeed, one or two more Chernobyls, God forbid, and there will be no one left to fight for language or culture in general. (Applause).

We must point out that in this sometimes uneven struggle initial victories have already been scored. The governmental resolution, which was recently published in the republic press, signed by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, on halting the building of the Chigirin nuclear power plant, triggered nationwide rejoicing in the Ukraine. But what about the Crimean one? For there is no single nuclear power plant in the world where such a threatening combination of geophysical dangers, specifically the possibility of earthquakes as high as 10 points, tsunami, the shifting of large masses of water of the Azov Sea, and ground shifts caused by active tectonic breaks, and gas and mud volcanism and sliding clay of the dome on which rests the Crimean nuclear power plant has come together.

Dear comrades from the Politburo and colleagues from the Supreme Soviet! This enumeration alone gives us grounds here to pass a resolution on immediately halting the building of the Crimean nuclear power plant. (Applause). The more as since all four task forces of the governmental commission have reached, by overwhelming majority vote, the conclusion that the planned seismicity of the station of seven points has been inadmissibly lowered. Comrades, without outside consultants, let us combine our spirit and, for the sake of life on earth, halt by ourselves the building of the Crimean nuclear power plant.

After the Chernobyl tragedy, on Belorussian territory alone, not to mention in the Ukraine, more than 520,000 people were exposed to radiation. To this day the Chernobyl nuclear power plant is a nursery of radioactive contamination with unforseeable results. In order to put out this source, which is a threat to all mankind, we must as of now take the only sensible decision of closing down definitively the Chernobyl nuclear power plant. (Applause).

I must tell you that the radioactive situation, the assertions of the Ministry of Atomic Power and Ministry of Health notwithstanding, is very difficult. To this day there are people living on a territory with a pollution in excess of 15 curies per square kilometer. Judging by the maps published in PRAVDA, the contamination is even higher in Belorussia, in some Bryansk areas. I therefore firmly support the appeal to the present congress addressed by the collective of the Institute of Geological Sciences of the Republic's Academy of Sciences, which asks, in particular, that information on the ecological situation including radiation, be assessed for each oblast, rayon, and settlement. An end must be put to the practice of having departments review existing standards in connection with changing situations and publish temporary admissible standards (VDU) of radioactive contamination, accepted by the Ministry of Health for the post-breakdown period. We must demand of the government to find ways and means of urgently removing the population from areas under strict radiation regime.

Based on the universal human principles of humanism and charity, and taking into consideration the real threat to the genetic stock of the Ukraine, Belorussia, and some Russian oblasts as a result of the accident, we must develop a national program for the protection of children, with mandatory organization of medical-sanatorium "mother and child" complexes, to treat the children from the afflicted territories.

We must draft and pass a law on the criminal liability of officials who conceal or distort information on the ecological and, specifically, the radiation situation and its effect on the population's health, for through their actions they grossly violate human rights and threaten human existence itself. (Applause). Until such a law has been passed, we must consider the question of the official involvement of leading personnel of different departments and commissions responsible for the existing situation.

I call upon those who have taken the Hippocratic Oath: Do not commit blasphemy by accusing the people of radiophobia. If such radiophobia has been noticed, it has come above all from the radio, on which the people are being falsely deceived, lulling them with false information. This sin is as unforgivable as the one of building reactors and burial sites for particularly dangerous substances secretly from the people. In this connection, I would like to obtain an explanation on the building of new blocks at the South Ukrainian and Rovno nuclear power plants where, as it were, the operating units are already short of water.

I would urgently request that rumors be either confirmed or denied of installing facilities for the burial of harmful waste within the 30-km plant area between Khmelnitskiy and Vinnitsa Oblasts. I have already presented the congress with the appeal, bearing hundreds of signatures by the population of Derazhnyanskiy Rayon on this subject.

Briefly, all departments, including the nuclear, must finally realize that before building their latest reactor, they should ask the permission of the people and the government of the respective sovereign socialist republic.

We shall be unable to solve these and other no less grave problems without proper consideration of the countryside, to which our state owes a great deal and will owe a great deal for quite some time. Already now, however, we must start by doing perhaps the minimum, equalizing the peasant with the worker in terms of pensions. This applies to the peasant who, in the course of his difficult 70 years does not know the meaning of a free day, paid leave, and a rest home, not to mention sanatorium, who spends his entire life in the mud of roadlessness, degradingly begging the bosses for a cord of word, and not even suspecting that in the vicinity of his village there are pipes carrying gas for the city. I believe that this endlessly patient laborer deserves to live a human life at least in his old age. (Applause).

I am not even mentioning the war widows, who plow the lean soil with their cows, who fed all fronts and the rear and who, crippled and alone, raised us, the half-orphans, as decent people and taught us how to live by the dictates of our conscience, and who received, for all this, a few miserable pennies. Unless we have lost our last bits of conscience, God himself would demand that they be given all the benefits of front line veterans. I thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Comrade Zoya Pavlovna Pukhova, chairman, Soviet Women's Committee, has the floor.

Z.P. Pukhova, chairman, Soviet Women's Committee, Moscow (for the women's councils united within the Soviet Women's Committee): Dear comrade deputies, I speak as a deputy representing the women's councils. I speak on behalf of the women, on behalf of those whose voices frequently remain unheard. Yet the questions which we raise are some of the most pressing and sensitive ones affecting our society. They affect the interests of one-half of the population of our country, one-half of those employed in the national economy.

What is it that concerns us, what do the women expect of this congress? They expect a real improvement in their situation. Not endless discussions, such as have become fashionable on how difficult it is for our women, but specific actions, practical steps to improve their life. In his report, Mikhail Sergeyevich stated that the women must be helped. So far, however, there has been no policy aimed at improving the situation of the women. There has been no governmental, overall, unified policies which would take into consideration national and regional features. Meanwhile the problems remain.

Comrades, let us ask ourselves: Why is it that there are more women than men working the night shift, and are there are more women performing hard manual labor and working in industries harmful to the health? What about the protection of motherhood? The family as well is waiting for real help. This is only part of the problem, the tip of the iceberg. And how much remains still under the surface? All such problems are interrelated. Therefore, they can be solved only comprehensively, through a unified state policy.

Today we must establish which are the priority tasks. We are confident that priority must be given to the entire set of problems which affect the interests of women and the family. Naturally, a strong social policy demands substantial funds. Such funds should be sought above all by bringing order in our planning and putting an end to irresponsibility in the country. We expect that the funds released as a result of reductions in the military budget will be part of those used for such purposes. The deputies who said here that we must live according to our means, assessing such means thoroughly, carefully, and sensibly, are right.

Comrade deputies, I assume that the reason for which many of you included the solution of the women's problem in your electoral programs was not merely to obtain the votes of the women. Today the women expect your actions so that the state of affairs can be changed in its essence.

The newly elected Supreme Soviet is setting up a committee on women's affairs. In no case should this committee become a women's commission in which women alone will solve their problems. This, comrades, is not a women's council under the Supreme Soviet. The establishment of such a committee should be based not on sex but on the fact that this is a general social problem, a problem of governmental significance.

We see it as a committee with legislative and control functions. We have many good laws the strict observance of which could substantially change the state of affairs. It

is time, finally, to supervise their implementation by ministries and departments which, ignoring the laws, are continuing barbarically to use women's manual labor, considering this less bothersome and more profitable than the application of the achievements of scientific and technical progress.

Reality calls for the formulation of new legislation which would enable us promptly to react to changes which are inevitable in our dynamic times, above all in the area of economics.

Under the conditions of the economic reform, enterprises and some republics have the possibility of directing some of their profits to help the various social groups among the population, including families with children. This would apply, for example, to wages and extending the leave of women to care for newborn children. However, so far we have no legal foundation for this. Could it turn out that such initiatives, which are needed in our society, prove to be illegal?

Comrades, we have an even greater fear. Could it be that it would be exclusively the Committee on Women's Affairs that would be dealing with such problems? Let us consider the protection of motherhood and childhood. In the final account, this ensures the health of the generations. Is it possible for such questions not to be the concern of the committee on health or ecological problems? For this, too, affects the health of our children, our future.

Here is another aspect of the matter: The active work of women who are people's deputies is necessary in all committees and commissions without exception: financial-budgetary, international relations, and international affairs. We appeal to you as well, Mikhail Sergeyevich, as chairman of the Supreme Soviet. We would like to hear in your speeches and in the speeches of the other heads of the party and the government, a more profound formulation of the question of the status of women in our country.

At the 19th All-Union Party Conference you called the women's problem a problem of governmental significance. Therefore, the approach to the problem as well must be governmental. In this connection, we would also like to turn to the USSR Council of Ministers and its chairman. A great deal in solving the women's problem depends on your actions. In particular, this applies to the decision to create a governmental mechanism on women's affairs. It is shameful to admit that in such matters we are behind not only the developed but many developing countries. A great deal was said about this 1 year ago, at the 19th All-Union Party Conference. Meanwhile, no resolutions were passed then and nor are there any now.

Here is another problem: It is extremely regrettable that the number of women among the people's deputies is quite modest. Women account for no more than 17 percent of the deputies. Naturally, to a certain extent this is our fault as well. However, it is a common problem, for in elections based on territorial and national-territorial districts, there were entire oblasts and even Union republics which neither nominated nor elected a single woman. Furthermore, how many women have been nominated by the party, the Komsomol or the other public organizations? The result is that women can work alongside the men and even in night shifts, and engage in hard and occasionally unhealthy type of work, but when it comes to participating in deciding the future of the country and handling their own destinies and those of their children, they are not given such an opportunity.

In conclusion, let me say this as well: Today there is considerable tension in the society. It comes out in debates, meetings, and even the proceedings of our congress. I am confident, however, that a solution does exist. It is found in conducting a respectful dialogue, in engaging in the joint search for decisions and the aspiration not only to formulate claims but also to listen to one another and to join forces. I thank you for your attention. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Dear comrades, today our outstanding Russian writer Leonid Maksimovich Leonov is celebrating his 90th birthday. Let us wish him well on behalf of our congress. (Applause, all rise).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Comrades, I announce an intermission of 30 minutes.

(Intermission).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Comrades, let us continue our work. Comrade Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin has the floor.

B.N. Yeltsin (Moscow City National-Territorial Electoral District, RSFSR): Dear comrade deputies! Dear voters of Moscow and other parts of the country! This congress is solving the main problem which will determine the future of our society. It is the question of power which must justifiably belong to the people represented by its supreme legislative authority, i.e., the Congress of People's Deputies.

My motion of a real transfer, precisely at this first congress, of the power from the party to the soviets, was not supported at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum held on the eve. The decision was made to recommend to leading positions those same individuals who had failed to take the society out of the crises in politics, economics, finances, and living standards. Added to this are the agenda and the procedure for the congress, drafted without taking the views of the deputies into consideration. I believe that this approach belittles the role of those elected by the entire people.

Paradoxical though it might be, this congress, which must assume the power and responsibility for restructuring and the reorganization of society, has turned out to be the hostage of the laws and resolutions passed by the preceding Supreme Soviet, which was established during the period of stagnation.

The most important problems of state power and management which, by the logic of the laws should be considered by the congress itself, were predetermined before the congress yet we are asked to vote for them. The rights of the congress in establishing the supreme power authorities and filling positions are extremely reduced. The only independent election was that of chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet will no longer be elected. There is no choice. Under these circumstances, the danger is not excluded that the Supreme Soviet, together with its Presidium, may turn out into an apparatus or, shall we say, a semi-apparatus under the chairman.

Meanwhile, the situation in the country remains extremely alarming. Anti-restructuring forces have become stronger and more consolidated; the second economy and corruption are developing; crime is rising; the moral foundations of society are being eroded; the problems of young people, who need the political confidence of our entire society, for the future belongs to them, are becoming aggravated.

The stratification of society on the basis of wealth is intensifying. The principles of social justice and social equality are not being implemented. The number of poor people is growing and the faith of the Soviet people in the real results of restructuring is declining. Contradictions in relations among nationalities are becoming aggravated. Obviously, we must create a Supreme Soviet commission on small nationalities.

The solution of the food problem is dragging out. The cumbersome administrative superstructure in agriculture remains. All that has changed is the names, and functions have been reassigned. How can one simultaneously restructure and hammer out anti-restructuring laws? In the year after the party conference, which supported a course of democratization, we struck with a single Ukase meetings and demonstrations; another Ukase hit at glasnost and yet another allowed the use of special troops against our own people. Naturally, there is also the unfortunate Article 11.1, the author of which we are still unable to identify and who, possibly, is sitting among us.

It is precisely in an atmosphere of such a prohibiting legislation, particularly of late, that crimes become possible such as those committed in Tbilisi. I was there and I realized that this precisely was a crime, a crime against our own people. In addition to the creation of a commission to investigate the Tbilisi events, in order somehow to calm the people down, the congress must be told who, nonetheless, made the decision in the center. (Applause). For this is something known to the leadership.

Today the broadest possible popular masses have not truly become involved in the management of the state. Our press, which did so much during the first steps of restructuring, continues to remain under the control of a group of individuals and does not reflect the entire variety of opinions of the members of our society. The governmental and social institutions are not being subjected to any whatsoever serious changes and are not being reduced. Their cumbersomeness is an unbearable burden to society.

The creators of stagnation have set legislative areas which remain outside the reach of the law. Organized crime has penetrated all social structures, including its superior echelons and the party. The domestic market has become disorganized. Inflation has increased. There are lines and rationing, and the threat of a financial collapse has become real.

The administrative-command system has not been eliminated. As in the past, the power belongs to the party-bureaucratic apparat. Like any revolution from above, as it develops and intensifies, restructuring affects all social strata. However, it affects most essentially the interests of the apparat itself as the power system. Hence the lack of resolve and the halfway nature of the decisions which are being made, running idle before taking any single step forward, shifts to the right and the left or even backpedaling. Hence the complicated, unnatural and, sometimes, even distorted decisions, encrusted with instructions. Many examples of this can be cited. The cumbersome power system suits exclusively the apparat. It gives it space for maneuvering and allows it, based on its experience and organization, and benefiting from the inexperience and disorganization of the deputies, to influence their decisions.

Comrades, the planned program and the promises given over the 4 years of restructuring, have not been fulfilled. The life of the people has worsened. Such is, in my view, the political evaluation of the present times. A certain self-criticism included in the speech by Comrade Gorbachev does not eliminate his responsibility for all this.

Let me say very briefly what and how, in my view, matters should be carried out for restructuring to move ahead. Above all, the USSR Congress of People's Deputies should consider the targets and tasks of the society and, taking them into consideration, set up commissions and begin to draft the new Constitution.

I believe that one of the tasks is firmly to decentralize the power and the economy, and to dismantle the command-administrative system. It is precisely from this that comes today the danger that society may return to the

past. Laws must be drafted to lay the foundations for the reorganization of society and for ensuring a radical change in production relations.

"The land to the peasant!" Yes, we must finally implement this slogan and the peasants themselves must determine the ways and means of farming and management. I fully support today the appeal of those who work in the countryside. (Applause). Unquestionably, not only the government and the Central Committee but the entire people must help the peasants. It is only then that we shall be able to move ahead in ensuring the country's food supply.

We must provide guarantees for the broadest possible democratization and glasnost and not hinder them, something which is already taking place. In order to accomplish this we must pass a law on the press. The mass information media should not belong on a mass basis to the party authorities. They must become increasingly independent. Today society has an urgent need for a collective search of ways to surmount the crisis. We must consult with the people. We must bring to light their tremendous creative and intellectual potential. We need a brain center of talented scientists, political experts, and economists who would formulate a strategy for the development of society, including a strategy for the development of the countryside.

The working people must be constitutionally given the right to elect the head of state from several candidates through universal, equal, and direct elections. Above all, we must solve the question of the role and place of the party in society. The formulation and adoption of the law on the party is an urgent task. Such a law would define the range of competencies and rights in decision making by the party authorities.

These are critical times and we cannot wait. The processes of party democratization are falling seriously behind the pace of democratization of society. The authority of the party among the masses is declining. In my view, the state of affairs in the party can be corrected by holding an extraordinary 28th CPSU Congress, the delegates to which should represent the entire party, chosen through alternate and direct elections held by primary organizations. Such a party congress should also consider problems of the general concept of restructuring, its strategy and tactics, and the purity of party ranks, and elect a new membership of the Central Committee, for its present one has failed to solve the formulated assignments within this period. (Applause).

I deem it necessary to touch upon such internal party problems at the Congress of People's Deputies, taking into consideration the special role and significance of our party in our society and its initiative in restructuring. Understandably, without a radical restructuring in the party the process of changes in society will not advance any further. The reform of the political system presumes radical changes in the structure of the authorities in charge of management, their functions and their rights. In 4 years nothing essential has been accomplished in this respect. The monopoly interests of departments are a restraining factor in restructuring. We must decisively reorganize the structure of the management authorities on the basis of the principles of cost accounting and voluntary unification of commodity producers and socialist competition. The center should retain only the right to define the overall ratios and to control production through the policy of investments, taxation, and other economic methods.

The rate of exchange of the ruble must be stabilized in order to ensure the successful implementation of the economic reform and surplus paper money not secured by commodities should be withdrawn from circulation. How can this be accomplished? I suggest, as one of the approaches, that temporarily, for the next few years, to reduce by 30 percent and not by 5-7-8 percent as has been suggested, the volume of centralized capitalist investments for industrial construction and withdraw from circulation the corresponding equivalent in currency. The rate of the ruble can be stabilized by other means as well. Suggestions on this account exist. This would solve three problems: It would take care of 30 billion in unfinished construction; it would strengthen the rate of exchange of the ruble and would make it possible of the enterprises to use their earned funds, for the construction workers would be looking for customers. Supply would exceed demand and the possibility would appear of providing more goods to the domestic market. Naturally, this is only part of the program. The number of ministries must be reduced in a way more decisive than is currently taking place; those who remain must be converted to a cost accounting basis, I have in mind the apparat, rather than financing them out of the state budget. (Applause).

Today progress in the economic reform is held back by the plans and the frequently erroneous rates set for the 12th 5-year period. I believe that the only acceptable option is not to lose one more year, but to define the new plans, programs, and rates for several years, starting with 1990 and 1991, and limit this 5-year period to 4 years.

In order for the reform to advance, greater political rights must be granted along with economic and financial independence and cost accounting to each Union republic which must be given territorial sovereignty. I support in its essence the motion submitted by Deputy Gorbunov on behalf of the Baltic republics, which includes the introduction of bilingualism. (Applause). The center should retain the right to coordinate the problems affecting the interests of the state and society at large.

Laws must be passed on pensions, poverty, ecology, and forms of ownership, without delay. Under the developing conditions, the congress must, above all, adopt a state program for taking the country out of the crisis. Such a program must be in the nature of emergency

measures. In more than 70 years we have been unable to advance in solving the problem of achieving some kind of social justice. All the proper reasons exist to speak of the existence of a system of elitism in our society which is building socialism. (Applause). Why is it that in the country there are dozens of millions of people living below any kind of poverty line while others are swimming in luxury? Protecting the interests of the poorest and socially defenseless social strata must become a principle of social justice. Perhaps we should begin, taking into consideration the scarcity, by eliminating all illegal privileges from the nomenclatura and, in general, remove from our vocabulary the word "nomenclatura." (Applause). This would enhance the moral condition of society. We must set an official subsistence wage.

This very congress should solve perhaps one specific social problem, otherwise the people would not understand us. Let us mention free availability of medical drugs and free urban transportation for the disabled and for people living below the poverty line and solving the pension problem, albeit partially. I shall submit to the Presidium the draft decree as a legislative initiative, formulated by a rather large group of deputies. Until we have been able to solve all problems of health care, I suggest that the Fourth Main Administration of the USSR Ministry of Health be directed into providing services for motherhood and childhood, for which it has very well-qualified people. (Applause). We need this for the sake of our future, in order to avoid living in conditions according to which infant mortality in the USSR is twice that of any civilized country.

I have a few remarks on the work of the congress. I must express yet another concern. The present congress, the Constitution, and the party have granted the head of state exceptionally broad rights. We see here a rather alarming trend: Against the background of an overall worsening of the economic situation and the aggravation of national problems there is a growth of personal influence and power in the hands of the head of state. Such a gap could lead to the temptation of solving our difficult problems through power methods. We could find ourselves once again, imperceptibly, trapped by a new authoritarian regime, a new dictatorship, the more so since in 70 years we have failed to gain experience in party, parliamentary or popular control over the activities of the head of state. I believe that within the framework of building a rule of law state the present congress must create corresponding collectively operating mechanisms. I suggest as one of the elements of such a mechanism that we pass a law on an annual referendum on the subject of a vote of confidence for the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. (Applause).

Comrades, the working people of the country, who have sent us to this congress, expect of us radical decisions, decisive actions in restructuring and real results. We must not disappoint them. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Comrade Suren Gurgenovich Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, has the floor.

S.G. Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, Yerevan (Leninakanskiy Territorial Electoral District, Armenian SSR): Dear comrade deputies, I would like to single out among the wide range of problems raised in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech those of national development and relations among nationalities, for it is precisely they that are today in the epicenter of the republic's sociopolitical life and it is precisely about them that I was instructed by the voters who sent me here to speak at the congress.

Today a most complex tangle of problems has developed in Armenia. The burden of socioeconomic difficulties and the aggravated dissatisfaction of the people, the unabated pain of historical memory and outbreaks of national self-awareness and sincere aspirations for democracy and occasional undemocratic forms of their manifestation, problems which took decades to accumulate, and the limited possibilities of solving problems which painfully affect the dignity of the people and, finally, the unparalleled earthquake which cut short the lives of hundreds of thousands of people, have created an extremely tense situation. They have triggered, a national stress, if you wish.

Anyone who visited the earthquake zone was able to see the brink of the precipice on which our people, our Republic found themselves. During the difficult hour of trial we were given a helping hand by all fraternal peoples, by the entire global community. The Armenian pain and concern became the pain and concern of the entire country. Our people will never forget this. During those tragic days we felt with particular strength the great achievement which the fraternal peoples of the USSR is.

The Armenian people have repeatedly stood on the brink of disappearance. Every time, however, they have risen, rebuilding from the ruins and ashes their cities and villages and ancient culture. The earthquake once again faced us with this task of unparalleled scale. In order to solve it we need an overall program for the revival of the Republic, a set of urgent measures for the social rehabilitation of the population and for surmounting negative demographic consequences of the elements and protecting the genetic stock of the nation.

We support regional cost accounting, economic independence, and sovereignty of republics. However, considering the extraordinary situation in which Armenia found itself, we also need new nonstandard decisions.

The interest of foreign countries, companies, and organizations in economic, scientific and technical, and monetary-credit cooperation with the Republic

increased sharply after the earthquake. The Armenian diaspora is ready to give us substantial help. It is an inseparable part of our people, with roots are deeply linked to the homeland.

Under these circumstances, the Republic could set up a zone of joint enterprise with the extensive involvement of foreign investments, not only in order to rebuild what was destroyed but also to solve a number of technical problems which are of interest to the entire country.

We believe that this is quite important in order to accelerate the recovery of the Republic from its condition of crisis. It is a step toward developing a mechanism for new forms of direct relations between Union republics and foreign countries. As a whole, in our view, it is necessary legislatively to define the rights of Union republics in establishing business and humanitarian relations with foreign countries in which live communities ethnically related to the nations and nationalities in our country.

Comrade deputies, the renovation processes affect the deep layers of common and global as well as local and regional interests. Reality has proved that any regional problem, unless solved on time, inevitably assumes a global nature and adversely affects the country as a whole.

For the past 18 months the drastically aggravating problem of Nagornyy Karabakh has been shaking up or Republic and our entire area and is echoing throughout the country. Here as well, in the Palace of Congresses, it was repeatedly heard these days. It tragically highlighted the entire sharp facets of relations between nationalities. For decades we repeated the high truth of Leninist national policy, that all peoples in our country are equal. For decades methodically the live shoots of relations among nationalities were cut short by officialdom.

Attempts are still being made to this day to replace a serious and honest study of the problem with high-sounding phrases about friendship and brotherhood and to reduce the aggravated nature of relations between nationalities merely, and I repeat merely, to intrigues of extremists and machinations of corrupt circles.

Confusing causes with consequences and heavy pressure on the part of the mass information media, manipulations of public opinion, and appeals for reciprocal understanding, not backed by real steps, can only aggravate the situation.

We must call things by their proper names. We are dealing with the consequences of the Stalinist antidemocratic approach to determining the destinies of nations. To acknowledge the inviolability of such decisions means to acknowledge as just and substantiated the activities of that regime which led socialism into a condition of grave deformations. I and other deputies from our Republic have been directly asked by the voters why, if today historical justice is being restored for individuals who suffered in the past, the same cannot be done when it comes to entire nations? (Applause).

Truth must be stared in the eyes. Despite the unsupported statement by Comrade Aliyev at the April 1989 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, for decades the national dignity and the social and spiritual demands of the Armenian population have been suppressed in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. Even the minimal rights granted by the Constitution to an autonomous oblast were violated. The clear and open injustice in relations between nationalities was precisely what led to the present crisis situation in the area.

Unfortunately, to this day, when it is particularly important to block even the slightest steps which lead to international discord and mistrust, frequently actions are committed which pit the interests of the Azeris against those of the Armenians in the NKAO.

We are trying to promote a normalizing of the situation, a dialogue, and a search for constructive decisions. However, we come across a variety of obstacles in establishing the natural relations between Armenia and Nagornyy Karabakh. The solution of any problem, whether economic, social or cultural, almost becomes a political problem. I do not even mention the trips by the leadership to our Republic. Men of science and culture cannot freely visit Nagornyy Karabakh.

In other words, to this day there have seen repeated occurrences of the old way of thinking and the old approaches.

For a number of years we absolutized class solidarity. We used it to lull ourselves. We see today that if national problems are neglected, national feelings may prevail in the life of a nation and an outburst of national solidarity triggered. In Armenia, the problem of Nagornyy Karabakh has become a nationwide idea, which has sunk so deeply into the hearts of the people that even the unparalleled natural catastrophe was unable to overshadow it.

The creation of the Committee for Special Administration of the NKAO is a compromise dictated by the real situation. Unfortunately, the committee inherited the legal imperfections of ob'ast autonomy and did not become an independent management system which would lead the autonomous oblast to the direct jurisdiction of the center. A mistrust in the committee developed among the people, the situation in the NKAO became once again aggravated, turning into a fuse worsening the situation in our Republic as well.

It is important, as was pointed out at a recent session of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo Commission on Problems of Nationalities to broaden the rights of the

Special Management Committee, and to grant it real rights independently to solve all the vitally important problems of the autonomous oblast.

At the same time, we also clearly see the need to restore the functions of the oblast authorities—the party obkom, and the oblast soviet—so that they could subsequently assume the full power and the right to be under central jurisdiction.

The country's leadership is paying great attention to the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh. Its problem has been repeatedly considered by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the government. As in the past, however, the problem remains pressing and the blood-draining wound is not healing.

Our congress has the important right of making decisions on holding referenda. I believe that the congress could exercise this right in the case of Nagornyy Karabakh. Let the population of that autonomous oblast decide its own fate freely, through the free manifestation of its will.

Each nation has its "sensitive spots." Such spots can be not only present but also historical. To the Armenian people, such a "sensitive spot" is the unhealing wound of the 1915 genocide, committed on the territory of western Armenia. In expressing the expectations of the Armenian people, the Republic's Supreme Soviet passed a law condemning genocide and addressed corresponding suggestions to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Once again we turn to the USSR Supreme Soviet with the urgent request to react to our proposals. Genocide, as a monstrous crime committed against mankind, must not be left without condemnation. (Applause).

The Sumgait tragedy, which was not properly assessed, triggered an explosion of protest and created the most difficult problem of refugees. Today we have 200,000 Armenian refugees from Azerbaijan in our republic. Tens of thousands of Azeris have left Armenia. Add 200,000 Armenian refugees and 530,000 people who found themselves without a roof after the earthquake, you can imagine the entire drama of the situation. Nearly one-third of the republic's population is without housing and many people are without jobs.

Nor can I fail to mention the helplessness shown by the law enforcement authorities and the union and republic commissions in determining the reasons and culprits for the mass poisoning of people at work, which has been going on for the past few months.

Delays in solving a number of pressing problems disrupt the republic, disorient the people, and create feelings of social and national defenselessness and a crisis of confidence in the republic's leadership.

The report justifiably noted the underestimating, at the start of restructuring, of the national problem. We are paying a high price for delays in solving some problems of relations among nationalities and for our slowness and halfway nature of the decisions which are being made.

The serious confrontation between the Armenian and Azeri people is a sad fact of our reality. It cannot be ignored. Our people will continue to live side by side. Preventing the worsening of the crisis in relations between the two nations and eliminating the conflict situation is a problem of exceptional importance. For that reason both republics and, above all, the communist parties of Armenia and Azerbaijan, must make use of all opportunities to eliminate the alienation and to restore an atmosphere of reciprocal understanding and trust.

Many difficulties in settling relations between nationalities are related to the lack of a legal mechanism for their democratic resolution and imperfections in the USSR Constitution, in which one article conflicts with another; some parts were drafted under new conditions while other, the majority, remain the legacy of the period of stagnation.

In our view, it would be useful for the congress to formulate a view on this matter and to determine how to make the fundamental law of the state consistent with present realities, including problems of relations among nationalities.

We are justly revising a great many things in this area. A course has been charted toward enriching the democratic principles in relations between the center and union republics, strengthening republic sovereignty, and solving problems of economic, social, and cultural life.

I believe that under these circumstances it is more important than ever to have a clear guideline, a reliable criterion which would help us to avoid equivocal steps and undesirable extremes. Such a guideline and criterion could be strengthening our Soviet state as a federation of sovereign republics.

Yes, our home must be renovated. This is a truth experienced by our society. Nonetheless, all our ideas and steps must be aimed at strengthening this home and building higher forms of integration among our republics and our peoples.

Comrades, I do not agree with those who are trying to cast aspersions on the work of our congress. Regardless of what it may cost us and the difficulties, it is taking place on a broad democratic basis. This is our first opportunity to engage in an open and honest discussion of our problems, compare various views, and state our positions. I believe this is a great accomplishment of the congress. It lays a good foundation for a fruitful search for a solution of the most difficult problems posed by this very responsible stage in the life of the country. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Metropolitan Aleksey, member of the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church, bishop of Leningrad and Novgorod, has the floor.

The next speaker will be Comrade Valentin Ivanovich Bakulin, head of a fitters brigade in Ivanovo.

A.M. Ridiger, member of the Russian Orthodox Church Holy Synod, Metropolitan Aleksey of Leningrad and Novgorod, Leningrad City (from the Soviet Charity and Health Foundation): Esteemed presidium, esteemed people's deputies! I believe this is the first time a religious figure has spoken from this high rostrum of our country. I would like first to thank Mikhail Sergeyevich for his report and the concept he proposed to us as a way out of the crisis situation. Of course, this concept will be enriched by deputies' speeches, and we should by joint effort find a means of escaping from the crisis situation in which our country and our society find themselves.

From this high platform I would like to say that Orthodox people and all our country's believers not only wholeheartedly support restructuring in the broad sense of the word but also see the processes of renewal being implemented as the real embodiment of their hopes and aspirations. We realize the complexity of the restructuring process, which must affect all spheres of our life—it is sometimes easier to build anew than to restructure. The progress of restructuring presupposes radical economic reform designed to turn the economy toward man, the democratization of internal life, and the moral renewal of our society. I would like to dwell on this last point in somewhat more detail.

The most important lesson that our country has derived from its recent past is the realization of the underlying linkage between morality and society's social development. As is well known, our history has confirmed the ancient truism that you cannot implement the most splendid social ideas by coercion without appealing to man's morality, his conscience, reason, moral choice, and inner freedom. That is why the grave situation in which our economy has found itself, and many aspects of public life, have their initial cause not only in someone's ill will and mistakes by specialists but also in the spiritual impoverishment that has afflicted our society. Our century has seen an unprecedented acceleration in scientific and technical progress—a sphere of mankind's activity which is on the whole exempt from morality. And look what has happened. Today as never before people are spiritually alienated from one another. They are indifferent to one another. This is in a world where man is receiving a hitherto unprecedented amount of information about the life of his colleagues in every part of the world via the most diverse technical channels and means of communication.

Ethics and moral principles are called upon to be that powerful means which will enable us to overcome people's disunity and spiritual alienation and will thus unite us as brothers and sisters to build a happy future for ourselves and our descendants. It is our restored sense of morality that is rendering us tolerant toward one another, charitable to all those who are suffering, the sick, invalids, the elderly, and the lonely, charitable to nature—a scornful and predatory attitude to the latter is a direct consequences of egoism and the unhealthy state of the human soul. (Applause).

I would like to urge all people's deputies from this rostrum to consolidate our efforts to resolve together the common questions with which we are faced. Crises in contemporary society are linked with the moral crisis, and because of this responsibility for moral education falls on all of us, on our entire society. Each person should build his relations with those around him, with society, and with nature on the foundation of a general human moral code. We must all realize that there is a direct link and a direct dependence between morality and survival. That is why the question of the moral education and improvement of all members of our society is very acute today. Academician Dmitriy Sergeyevich Likhachev put this very well from this rostrum; he was speaking about culture, but culture and morality are interconnected.

The church and religious associations are prepared to take part in this process of ensuring the moral renewal of our society, and we await with hope the adoption in the near future of a law on freedom of worship which would give the church greater opportunities for taking part in the social life of our society. (Applause).

Our congress is taking place at a remarkable time which may fundamentally change the course of the country's development. The international situation today is also promoting this. Two days before our congress began I returned from the Swiss city of Basel where the European Christian Ecumenical "Peace and Justice" Assembly had taken place. This meeting was virtually beyond compare. Representatives of all European Christian churches gathered together to discuss burning issues of the day—peace, disarmament, justice, and the preservation of our natural environment. We discussed these questions for a week and reached a unanimous decision, after setting out our solutions in a general document. It touches on all problems facing mankind today. Europe's Christians expressed readiness to work together without procrastination, as Prof Carl von Weizsaecker urged them: "There's no time to lose." We have to work together to ensure mankind's survival and the preservation of peace, justice, and our natural environment. Permit me to convey this assembly's documents to the head of our state. (Applause). (He hands documents to the presidium).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Comrade Valentin Ivanovich Bakulin, head of a fitters brigade, Ivanovo Spinning-Finishing Factory, has the floor. The next speaker will be Comrade Vladimir Vasilyevich Kazarezov.

V.I. Bakulin, head of a fitters brigade, Krasnaya Talka Spinning-Finishing Factory, Ivanovo, RSFSR (from the USSR trade unions): Comrades, I, a people's deputy from the workers city of Ivanovo, am very pleased to note that the time of proceedings of our congress coincides with the 84th anniversary of the establishment of the Ivanovo-Voznesensk all-city soviet of worker deputies, the first of its kind in Russia. (Applause). This was an initial political effort which proved that the voice of the workers is very important in solving major governmental problems.

Today, as we feel the revolutionary spirit which restructuring in the activities of the soviets carries with it, we sharply feel our personal responsibility for the future of the country. The attention and thoughts of all working people, of those who have entrusted us with the mandate of representing the people, are turned to the congress. A great deal is expected of us, above all to provide answers to questions related to the further course of restructuring and, therefore, to improving our living standard. This is the main thing. I have always believed that the present congress must not be reduced to meeting-style speeches, attempts to mix everything and to introduce confusion and division and prevent the deputies from discussing the most serious problems of domestic and foreign policy. (Applause).

I am in constant touch with the people of Ivanovo, who are particularly concerned by the fact that some deputies have mounted an open struggle for political power through a variety of methods, going as far as to resort to insults, threats, and labeling. The voters object to this. They believe that such an atmosphere in the congress can only worsen the situation in our country. I, a rank and file party member, am worried by the mood of deputies whose speeches and actions are aimed at belittling the role and significance of the CPSU and of the restructuring processes under way. Efforts are being made to drive a wedge between the party and the people: Clearly, such people have their far-reaching political objectives. Is it difficult to understand that it is precisely as a result of the party's initiative, of its Central Committee and Politburo, that changes are taking place in the country's economy and social life and that it is not a matter of indifference to us, comrades, who will lead restructuring on. We do not see any force other than the Communist Party and we shall support its policies. (Applause).

I am amazed at the silence which the party workers are keeping at the congress. Why are they not rebuffing the clearly extremist attacks on the party? If the ideas of restructuring are dear to us...(applause) we, communists, must not stand aside and avoid discussions. In supporting the stipulation in the report submitted by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, let me assert that despite all difficulties restructuring is yielding a positive result. We see this through our own examples: Democratization and glasnost are gathering strength; the people's initiative is being released; work in industry is improving, albeit not as it should. Although very slowly, matters are also improving in agriculture. This instills confidence in the accuracy of the course chosen by the party. Nonetheless, some manifestations of stagnation and unsolved problems are also characteristic among us, the people of Ivanovo. Let me frankly say that there is a pressing need for everyone not simply to contribute to the work but to work with all his forces to come out of the swamp, to pull himself out, even if someone may find this quite painful. The working class is seriously concerned about not talking restructuring out to death. Actually, every time we hear that the 27th Party Congress was a critical moment; the 19th All-Union Conference was critical; the various plenums have been critical. This congress is also critical; that is the way we live. We are breaking things and fighting battles. (Stirring in the hall). As a worker, let me say that the people have become tired of many words and promises. They want action and a clearer line in economic policy.

Bearing in mind that the Congress of People's Deputies is formulating a program for action by our government, let me present my own views on a number of basic problems of socioeconomic policy, which define the interests of the working people. In our view, they need immediate resolution. I would like to propose as an instruction to the country's Supreme Soviet, to approach more profoundly, with greater consideration and balance, the formulation and adoption of economic decisions and programs. During the period of restructuring so many resolutions have been passed that their implementation should have drastically enhanced the economy; in practice, however, we draw up a program, we set deadlines and levels, we give people promises and guarantees and at the same time we violate them and we even backpedal. Let me consider two features which, by virtue of the nature of the work, are the closest to me. A great many hopes were generated in the textile workers by the resolution on radically upgrading the technical standards of domestic machine building. We thought that technical progress in textile machine building would enable us to come up to world standards, facilitate the work of our respected and dear women and improve the quality of the goods. Obviously, this did not happen. Instead of highly productive and highly electronized equipment, we witnessed the birth of two other resolutions issued by the central authorities on the unsatisfactory and extremely unsatisfactory implementation of previous resolutions. In this case, as we know, no one was held responsible, neither the authors of the documents nor those who executed them. It seems to me that the Supreme Soviet must find the necessary instruments drastically to upgrade responsibility for the implementation of resolutions, including the firing of the specific culprits. I am firmly convinced that if we fail to strengthen performing discipline in the immediate future, ranging from worker to member of the government, we shall be unable to reach the highest possible labor productivity or even make any essential improvement whatsoever in the country. (Applause).

The problem of supplying the people with goods has become aggravated to its extreme. Major governmental

leaders have repeatedly referred to the salutary step taken in solving this problem by the March 1988 party Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree, which calls for the construction, reconstruction, and retooling of hundreds of enterprises in our sector. However, the very first year of application of this most firm document proved its unbalanced nature. One of the construction projects included our Krasnaya Talka factory. The deadline for the designs came and neither the Gosplan nor the Union Ministry of Light Industry can or even promised to solve the question of who will be rebuilding the enterprise, costing tens of millions of rubles in construction and installation? We cannot understand why, even with a governmental decision, one must try to prove that this decision must be implemented. When will there be respect for state resolutions? When shall we put an end to making the rounds of ministries and departments hat in hand? I deem it necessary, before it is too late, for the respective authorities to draw up a kind of inventory of already passed resolutions. In promoting the priority development of a given sector in one resolution we speak, in another, of the need to stop, to freeze, and so on.... This is an indication of the hastiness with which resolutions are drawn up, resolutions which affect the destinies of collectives of thousands of people.

It is also important to eliminate the practice of adopting conflicting documents which, today, has become virtually the norm. A number of resolutions have been issued by the superior authorities which prohibit the development of industrial construction in the nonchernozem. Meanwhile, one after another, resolutions are being passed on the building of new plants, ignoring the opinion of the local population.

In my view, the Supreme Soviet and the country's government must concentrate, on a priority basis, material and financial resources on the development of the material and technical base of the construction industry, for without it we cannot solve food, housing or other problems. Already now the textile workers in the oblast have accumulated more than 100 million rubles in the production and social development funds and are unable to use them because of lack of material resources and capacities of contracting organizations. Our people wait for an apartment between 15 to 18 years. Without developing this sector we cannot hope to solve the political problem which has been formulated, that of providing every family with housing by the year 2000.

As chairman of the labor collective council of the enterprise, want it or not, I must deal with problems of economics. I have extensively read the writings of Comrades Abalkin, Selyunin, Shmelev, Popov, and others. But what, comrade scientists, comes out of all this? The authors keep criticizing each other. One says that "we must promote an economic reform;" another says that "the time has not come, our masses have not matured for this." What is the solution? Whatever course the implementation of the economic reform may take, there must be no worsening of the life of the people. I would think that this question should be clear to everyone. However, every day we see the empty shelves of stores, unrestrained speculations, and price increases. It is time for the leading economists to turn from debates to the formulation of specific ways of treating our economy. (Applause). And as healers, they must bear responsibility for its fastest possible recovery. (Applause).

Nor should I fail to point out that the working class today is concerned with the development of the cooperative system. At first we expected that the market would be saturated with the necessary goods, that the problem of shortages will be resolved, and that there would be a healthy competition with the state sector. What actually happened? We see that the cooperatives have caused social injustice, a decline in discipline, and an increase in the crime rate. They have dipped their hands into the pockets of workers and retirees, and have created an uncontrolled channel for converting cashless into cash funds mostly without any additional output of goods. Against this background there has been a sharp stratification in society. On the one hand, we have people who earn thousands. On the other, millions of people are not ensured even a minimum wage. Particularly hurt are those who, with their toil, built the country during its hardest times. The legislative authorities must urgently complete work on problems related to the development of the cooperatives and see to it that they indeed become a need and not a phenomenon in our lives.

Comrade deputies, I would like to see the Supreme Soviet and the government prove their activities by steadily improving the life of the single Soviet people and for the reputation of our country to grow steadily not only abroad and, above all, that the pride felt by our own people in their homeland in the most just, humane, and progressive socialist system of ours be revived. I address myself to the working people of the country, to the workers of Moscow and Leningrad: Remember, do not forget the words of Vladimir Ilich Lenin: "The proletariat of Moscow, Peter, and Ivanovo-Voznesensk... proved in action that it will not surrender the gains of the revolution for anything." Today we must firmly hold onto these positions. (Prolonged applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Comrade Vladimir Vasilyevich Kazarezov, first secretary of the Novosibirsk Obkom, has the floor.

V.V. Kazarezov, first secretary of the Novosibirsk Oblast CPSU Committee, (Tatarskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Novosibirsk Oblast): Comrade deputies! As a party worker, I should perhaps talk more today about the political aspects of restructuring, but I will be dwelling on the economic aspects, because there has unquestionably been progress in the political sphere.

It is quite obvious to me that if there is no improvement in the people's standard of living in the near future and if urgent social programs are not implemented, people

will start to lose faith in the possibility of any positive changes at all. And this would mean the end of restructuring, from whichever direction it came—from the left or from the right. (Applause).

The economy is ill with a serious, chronic disease and I, at least, can see no signs of improvement at present. It seems to me that we have not properly assessed the real depth of the economic crisis. As far as the most recent period is concerned, official assessments have clearly tried to embellish the true state of affairs. This is quite intolerable. Studies conducted by Siberian economists have shown that in the first 3 years of the 5-year period the growth in industrial output has not been 13 percent, as statistical reports would have us believe, but only just over 4 percent—and only 1 percent in 1988. It seems that the remainder of the increase, or, to be more precise, the appearance of an increase has been achieved through concealed price rises and flawed statistics. (Applause).

It is possible that our scientists are overdramatizing the situation, but I do not think that this is to any significant degree. So, I would like to conclude this theory in my speech with an appeal for a totally accurate assessment of the socioeconomic situation in the country, and consequently feel it possible to instruct the newly elected Supreme Soviet and the appropriate commissions to look more deeply into the situation and inform deputies and the population. But it seems more important to establish the reasons for the increasing deterioration in the situation, and more important still to look for ways out of this situation. I could, at this point, talk about our national economy's unreceptiveness to scientific and technical progress, or about how economic reform is marking time and so forth, but a great deal has already been said on the subject and, I am sure, will be said yet. I do not want to deprive scientists and economists of their living. I would like to talk about something else—and on this I am in agreement with the previous speaker—namely, about the low level of competence and weak scientific study when substantiating major decisions in our country, and also about the half-hearted, timid, inconsistent approach to putting these decisions into practice.

You can judge for yourselves the kind of impression that could have been created by the formulation of the task ahead 3 years ago: To ensure that 80-95 percent of basic output is manufactured to world standards by 1990, or, in other words, ensure the kind of leap forward that would make your head spin. It was a bitter, painful experience for the country's leadership when, at every step, people showed amazement at such an unrealistic task, to put it mildly, and, after all, we have been obliged to motivate party organizations and collectives to fulfill this task. Where is this incompetence coming from? I would like to ask you, Mikhail Sergeyevich, to consider what kind of advisers suggest these kind of decisions. Take a really recent decision. The state order for agricultural output is to be conveyed to republics and oblasts but not to individual economic units. In my view, this approach is not only incorrect and illogical, it is also immoral. There must be either one thing or another: Either we abandon the state order from top to bottom, if we are ready for this, or we retain it for a while—again from top to bottom. Otherwise we end up with a conflict between oblast- and rayon-level leadership, on the one hand, and the direct producers of agricultural output on the other, while the center takes a highly respectable democratic position.

There is more. It seems to me that we are causing problems by our ill-considered approach to changing investment policy under the guise of reorientation toward the social sphere. Here, too, I have an example. It is planned to reduce investments in the development of the heat and electric power industry together with other industrial ministries. I will not attempt to judge the situation in the country as a whole (although it is now our duty to think of the country as a whole), but for Novosibirsk Oblast this will mean an impasse situation in social development. Look at what is happening. Last year a USSR Council of Ministers resolution was adopted on the development of the power industry in Novosibirsk Oblast, which envisaged almost doubling capital investments in the Ministry of Power and Electrification in 1990 in comparison to the 1988 level. It has been estimated that the shortage of heat for Novosibirsk alone amounts to 1,000 kilocalories. There is also a considerable shortage of electricity. But it is in fact planned to reduce investments for 1990 to below the present level. Anatoliy Ivanovich Mayorets, minister of power and electrification, explains this as a reduction in capital investments in the power industry within the framework of the general reduction of industrial construction in the country. I would not just call this a shortsighted policy—it is something worse. We are talking about the social sphere, but just try to name a more social sector than heat and electricity generation! When there is no meat you can substitute potatoes and pasta for it for a while; when there is no soap you can get by for a few days, washing without it. (A stir in the audience). But how, in Siberia, with temperatures of minus 40 degrees, can you live if it is cold in your apartment and at work? How are we to heat new housing, schools, kindergartens, and hospitals, which we are now building in greater numbers (and we are indeed building them in greater numbers, comrades), if there is not enough heat to go around, once they are built? We will be forced to curtail our social programs. And the reality of building 1 billion square meters of housing per year across the country, which Mikhail Sergeyevich talked about in his report, is a great problem in this connection. That is why I talk of an impasse situation and urge deputies, particularly those who will be working on the relevant commissions, to help to speed up the development of the heat and electric power industry.

Furthermore, a paradoxical situation has developed in our country. On the one hand, there is excessive centralization in economic management and, on the other, the

center is completely powerless when it comes to organizing the division of labor and integrating production and scientific potentials. I see this as one of the main reasons for our lagging behind. After all, in my opinion, in terms of the degree of cooperation and specialization in industry, particularly in machine building, and in terms of certain other indicators, we are at the level of premonopolist capitalism. Take a look at our country's machine-building plants. Each one represents a combine with a selection of virtually every technology available. There is everything here: casting, forging, welding, machine-tool, and other production operations. They have virtually every type of instrument, spare parts, industrial holder and fastener, and standard fitting; each one makes them for itself. I am sure that if all this were produced at specialized enterprises, the prime cost of machine-building output would be sharply reduced, the quality and technical standard of this output improved, and the amount of materials used in the process reduced. Comrades, I have studied the documents of party congresses, beginning with the 23d congress. Like an incantation, they have repeated the thesis on the need to develop production specialization and cooperation, but the process has in fact gone in the opposite direction. Four years of restructuring have produced nothing and the situation has only got worse.

Or, take this situation: Realizing it is futile to hope for centralized organization of the production and supply to villages of machinery and equipment they so need, such as silage combines, hay-making equipment, cranes, and so forth (agricultural workers here in the hall know that they certainly do not have enough of all these things—not to mention supplies of new equipment for agriculture), we decided to organize the production of all these things ourselves in the oblast, scattering assemblies and components to dozens of plants. Moscow has given us a pat on the back for this. But what kind of pat on the back do they deserve, when the machinery is going to be several times more expensive and the quality several times more inferior? This is quite barbaric: Each oblast making its own agricultural machinery when the country has such a powerful machine-building potential! And I know that Sverdlovsk, Voronezh, and other oblasts are doing the same as us. But we are ruining the country, comrades, with this kind of approach! How can we talk seriously of restructuring in the economy in view of this? On the whole, as I see it, this is restructuring back to front.

I would like to say a few words about regional economic accountability and self-management. I, like the overwhelming majority of people, am categorically in favor of this. I can understand how this is viewed at union republic level. But what about us, the krays and oblasts—are we each supposed to withdraw into our own cocoon? It seems to me that we should be thinking about making the transition to a region-based administrative system—for example, the Urals, West Siberia, the Far East, the Center, and so forth—and, perhaps, give these regions the rights enjoyed by the union republics in economic respects. (Applause).

A few more words about regional economic accountability. It should be total. It is thought, for example, that investments in science yield the greatest effect. If that were so with regard to the region where science is located, Novosibirsk Oblast would be the most prosperous in the whole country, because in terms of strength of scientific potential we cede place only to Moscow and Leningrad—and possibly Kiev. We have three academy branches here: the USSR Academy of Sciences, the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences, and the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences. The fact that they are concentrated in one city is, in my opinion, wrong, but it is too late to talk about that now. We will take the view that history has ordained it so. But in that case it should be to our advantage to develop science, receiving an appropriate percentage for the local budget from the results of scientists' work (and, what is more, work financed from the budget and work based on an economic contract) introduced not only here but elsewhere in the country and sold abroad. Then, firstly, it would be clear exactly what kind of feedback we are getting from our three branches. And, secondly, if the feedback from investments in science really proves to be the most profitable, we will give it priority development at the expense of other sectors and programs, meaning by this that we will resolve many local social problems by using the dividends from science.

A few more words about science. It really does need to very seriously review its attitude to itself. We have outstanding scientific cadres and scientific results of world standard. But it is a thorny path from ideas to practice. The main thing here, apart from the ineffectual economic mechanism, is the weakness of our experimental base, which has already been much discussed. How can the situation be put right? The presidium of the Siberian Branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences takes a traditional approach to this: It is proposing the construction of new institute buildings (the same old extensive course of action again), which means a further increase in the number of new building projects. What can I say? I myself have an allergy to new construction work. And with regard to this particular issue, the position is this: First, building new premises and fitting them out with equipment, thereby investing millions and millions of rubles, is not the same thing as creating an experimental base for institutes. And who is going to work in these premises? Second, for us it will mean setting aside the solution of vital social problems, which, naturally, is something we cannot agree to.

So what is the solution? A solution does exist. In connection with the cuts in arms expenditure and the conversion of defense enterprises, a number of plants in defense sectors should be placed at the disposal of science for use as an experimental base. (Applause). These plants' output would then be redistributed among other enterprises. This is no simple matter, of course, but it would be the sensible thing to do from the state's point of view and would also represent a restructuring of attitudes in these very important areas.

The last point, esteemed comrades deputies. I would like to say a few words about Siberia. We have already heard the words of our great ancestor, Mikhail Lomonosov, in this hall, about how Russian might would be increased by Siberia. What can I add to this? The accelerated development of Siberia's productive forces is an important component of CPSU strategy, but this strategy is not being implemented satisfactorily. The main thing is that there is no mechanism to stimulate the accelerated development of regions of Siberia. But if we recall the end of the last century and the beginning of this one, there was a massive resettlement to Siberia—voluntary, not forced—from the center of the country, the Ukraine, Belorussia, and other regions. It was Stolypin, a now undeservedly forgotten Russian statesman, who initiated the reform which ensured this resettlement, without which Siberia's present level of development would not have been possible.

Where are the statesmen of today who could offer something similar, which would make it possible for our country to more actively engage Siberia's powerful potential to the benefit of all the people? (Applause). Many incentives could be considered. But the main point is that only a substantially higher standard of living in Siberia can ensure an influx of fresh forces and stop the indigenous population from leaving for the country's western regions.

Siberian scientists now estimate that at present the level of consumption and use of the most important benefits and services in Siberia, including food, housing, and units in the non-production infrastructure, is below average for the republic. The shortfall will be even more serious if you consider the need to compensate for the harsher natural and climatic conditions, which require a minimum increase of 20-40 percent in the consumer budget in Siberia's southern regions and an increase of 1.5-2 times in its northern regions in comparison to the country's central regions. I ask you to see my speech as raising the question of increasing Siberia's zonal differentiation coefficient. I am sure that giving priority to raising the population's living standard in Siberian regions not only accords with the principles of social justice but is also an essential condition of implementing very important all-union economic programs. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: So, comrades, the following motion has been made: to terminate debates by dinner time and solve some problems.

Yesterday a vote was taken on elections to the Council of Nationalities from the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. Deputy Yuriy Andreyevich Osipyan, chairman of the vote tallying commission, will report on the results of the vote.

Yu.A. Osipyan: Comrade deputies, in accordance with the procedure approved by the congress, a secret vote was taken and its results were tallied by the commission at the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, counting the votes cast for the elections to the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet from the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and determined that the following candidacies of people's deputies of the USSR, listed alphabetically, were included in the slate for a secret vote on elections to the Council of Nationalities from the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast: Z.G. Balayan, V.D. Dzhafarov, and G.A. Pogosyan. Two thousand one hundred and thirty ballots were issued for the vote on USSR people's deputies. The ballot boxes were opened, and a total of 2,109 ballots were counted. A total of 2,108 ballots were declared valid, and one was judged invalid. It was destroyed. The votes were broken down as follows: Z.G. Balayan: 726 for and 1,382 against; V.D. Dzhafarov: 1,884 for and 224 against; G.A. Pogosyan: 1,437 for and 671 against.

Therefore, the following USSR people's deputies were elected to the Council of Nationalities from the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast: Dzhafarov, V.D. and Pogosyan, G.A.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Are there any questions for Comrade Osipyan? No questions? Comrades we must ratify the results of the vote on the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

I put the matter to a vote. Those in favor of the ratification of these results please say so. Thank you. You may lower your hands. Opponents? Please count the votes, comrades. Abstentions? (Votes are counted).

A.G. Kostenyuk: Dear delegates, following are the results of the vote: "Nay," zero; abstained, five deputies. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Therefore, the protocol is approved. There is one more vote to be taken. We can now definitively, I emphasize, definitively ratify the protocol of the ballot counting commission for elections to the Council of Nationalities, taking into consideration elections for the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and our previous resolution to approve the voluntary withdrawal of the candidacy of Deputy A.I. Kazannik and the election to this chamber of Deputy B.N. Yeltsin.

Today we must take a final vote on the entire membership of the Council of Nationalities. Let us vote. Those in favor, please raise your certificates. Thank you.

Who is against? Please count the votes. Whoever is against raise your hands higher. (Votes are counted).

A.G. Kostenyuk. Dear deputies, seven votes were cast against.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: There were seven against. Are there any questions? Are there abstentions? Please raise your certificates.

A.G. Kostenyuk: Two deputies abstained.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Two deputies abstained. Therefore, the protocol of the ballot counting commission for elections to the Council of Nationalities is approved. The matter is closed.

Now a few announcements, communications, and motions. Several deputies have expressed to the presidium the wish to meet with the heads of some ministries and departments. As you know, all members of the government and heads of organizations and departments are present here. Therefore, we suggest that the ministers and heads of central departments be approached during intermissions. This can be done in writing as well. The requests may be submitted to the Secretariat which will organize the contact between deputies and the heads of ministries and departments. Is this motion acceptable? Thank you. This matter is closed.

Next, People's Deputy Statulyavichyus asks why deputy questions are not published in the congress' bulletin? He asks that they be published. Let me inform you that, all told, today the secretariat has received 14 questions posed by deputies to the government, ministries, departments, and other. Tomorrow data on such questions and instructions will be considered and distributed by the secretariat to the deputies. There is another motion. Several deputies have asked what has become of their motions. Deputies or representatives of individual groups of deputies or republics could go to the third floor, where the Secretariat is located, and check whether their mandate, suggestions, and so on, are there. It is important for all of them to be recorded and properly duplicated and distributed among the deputies.

A couple of other matters remain. There is a note here according to which Deputies Comrades Nosov, Umarkhodzhayev, and others suggest that debate speeches be limited to 10 minutes. We must report this to the congress and seek the advice of everyone how to proceed. As you know, in our regulation we approved a 15-minute limit. Shall we change it or leave it as is? (Stirring in the hall). Perhaps we should vote? Well, in order to deal with this item, the following motion has been made....

From the hall: (Unintelligible).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: So, we shall not vote then? (From the hall: No.) That is all, the motion is withdrawn. Here are a few small announcements. Ivan Denisovich Stefanenko, deputy from the All-Union Organization of War and Labor Veterans, writes that some speakers try to distract the congress from the solution of the basic problems. He is offering his services in preventing this from happening. I believe that all of us will take this into consideration in the future, in our addresses. Obviously, his remark is just.

Yet another interesting motion has been made. It has been submitted by Comrade Yuriy Vasilyevich Popov from Leningrad, deputy director for scientific affairs of the Leningrad Scientific Research Institute of Psychoneurology imeni V.M. Bekhterev. He writes, I shall read here a very short note, and he will not have to speak. "Please give me, before the intermission, the possibility to address an appeal to the World Health Organization to adopt 31 May as Nonsmoking Day!" (Applause). Allow me to read the note in full: "Throughout the world the attitude toward this problem is extremely serious. The television is transmitting not only the sessions of the congress but also talks during intermissions where one can probably see people smoking. It would be shameful to display to the entire world the fact that the USSR people's deputies are ignoring the appeals of this authoritative world organization." (Applause). We shall take this into consideration.

Here is another small motion. Comrades, just a minute, we heard here a very important and interesting appeal by deputies, essentially farmworkers, although it has been signed by many people who are not agricultural workers, but which is very serious. There is a motion, from the Presidium, that, to begin with, it be duplicated and distributed among all deputies and, second, that the Supreme Soviet and the corresponding commission, which we shall define, currently it is known as the commission in charge of food supplies, and we do have such a commission, and it could be given a different name, we shall determine this and also submit it to the government, to the USSR Council of Ministers, for such problems to be considered in great detail before the autumn and that corresponding motions be drafted, which would be officially submitted to the consideration of the next congress. Do the deputies second this motion? Is no vote required? It is not. That is all. All announcements have been made, and I declare an intermission until 1600.

Chair: A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

A.I. Lukyanov: Comrade deputies, we are continuing our debates on the basic directions of domestic and foreign policy of the USSR. Deputy Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, has the floor.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, Vilnyus (Vilnyus-Leninskiy Territorial Electoral District, Lithuanian SSR): Dear congress, dear comrades, by the will of the people we are turning a new page in the history of our country. The development of the state once again demands of us to give all power to the soviets. It is for that sake that we were elected and that is what we must discuss. Today we must invest in this slogan a qualitatively new content. Over the past 7 decades we have repeatedly proclaimed full power to the soviets, occasionally depicting wishes as reality. Restructuring, which

began in April 1985, took us to a decisive historical line. The sociopolitical situation which developed demands of us to review some values and take another look at the content of political categories, such as the socialist state, ownership, sovereignty, and union. For the sake of fairness we must point out that the current difficult situation in the country is not the result of restructuring only, something of which we are frequently accused. It is the result of our entire complex and tragic history and painful search for the creation of a political and economic system consistent with the ideals of socialism. Today hardly anyone could deny that the country is on the threshold of economic and, consequently, and perhaps imminent political crisis. For that reason real steps must be taken to come out of the developing situation. The people have become tired of theoretical debates. They want to feel changes for the better in their daily lives.

We consider as the main way for solving the problems which have accumulated to be the full solution of the crucial problems presented in the speech by the Supreme Soviet chairman and the speeches of the deputies, and the stipulations of the 19th All-Union Party Conference. Contradictions between the center and the republics and among sectorial interests in the area of national relations developed as a result of excessive centralization in the Soviet Union. Let us also recall the events in Georgia, Karabakh, and Armenia and many events in our Baltic area. The solution of these contradictions, in our view, is possible only through the exercise of the rights of the sovereign peoples as the foundation for the creation of a rule of law society. The USSR, as the unification of these sovereign peoples, must, in this case, be based on the respective implementation of other necessary treaties: economic and interrepublic. Harmony in relations among Union authorities and republic authorities must be based on the efficient and just demarcation of these competencies. In this case we must establish the precise limits of what is exclusively within the competence of the USSR and the exclusive competence of Union republics, and only in individual cases should there be a matter pertaining to joint competence. A multinational union becomes such only by abandoning the existing stipulations of unification in all areas. Above all, the fundamental law of the USSR must clearly define the very concept of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It must reflect the principles governing its establishment and functioning and the legal acceptance of ethnic, political, and economic variety. The current Constitution has become a hindrance to the implementation of such changes. Today the republics are virtually deprived of the possibility of solving problems of the development of the economy and the accumulated problems of ecology and sociopolitical life, which the center, as reality has indicated, is unable to solve properly. This situation objectively introduces a certain tension in the field of relations among nationalities throughout the country as well as within the individual republics. At the last session of the Republic's Supreme Soviet, we were forced to amend some articles of our Constitution, thus making it possible to improve production and social relations. We believe that such a legislative initiative does not conflict with the present spirit of restructuring.

Lines, shortages, empty shelves.... These are words which are not disappearing from our vocabulary. Naturally, from the viewpoint of economics this situation as well has its historical origins. The economic reforms which have been carried out in the country over the past quarter of a century failed to yield desired results essentially because the old methods used to improve the country's economy had become obsolete. We must not deal merely with decorating the facade when a basic capital repair is needed. We need a true revolutionary economic reform, the implementation of which we consider possible through the economic independence of the individual republics, above all. Unfortunately, foot dragging, dashing around, and secrecy in making vitally important decisions are still characteristic of the work style of many Union departments. We are limited in opportunities to maneuver and make independent decisions in an entire array of cases. Interpreting ministerial instructions, taking regional conditions and the level of economic development into consideration, is not always either possible or acceptable.

Several months ago we published a draft Republic concept of economic autonomy, which was supported by the broad population strata. Last February we submitted our considerations on matters of economic autonomy to the CPSU Central Committee and, subsequently, to the Council of Ministers and, hence, to the USSR Gosplan. Unfortunately, all that saw the light were the "General Principles...," which, I hope, are familiar to all deputies. Once again they standardize and lead to unanimous concepts applicable to all republics. Naturally, we cannot understand such a fear of a good initiative. Naturally, also puzzling is the behavior of the country's Gosplan. I doubt the existence in this hall of even a few deputies who think that we would be able to free our economic ship from the rock on which it has been stuck for more than 1 year through the old economic management methods.

We must point out that standardization is inherent in the overwhelming majority of documents coming from the center. Meanwhile, on different levels it is being acknowledged and emphasized that the political and economic situation is not the same for all republics. Taking all of this into consideration, at the latest session of the Republic's Supreme Soviet we passed a law on the foundations of economic autonomy, which is not a copy of the "General Principles...." In our opinion, it will help us to solve a number of pressing problems of departmental diktat. It will contribute to improving relations and free the Republic's constructive potential. It is my view that the implementation of this law could be a model for enhancing our Republic's economy. Such models have been drafted by other republics as well and, naturally, with the least possible risk to the entire country. At the same time, a group of Baltic deputies have formulated a

draft USSR Law on Economic Independence of Union Republics. Its purpose is to democratize the USSR and ensure the restructuring of economic policies. Its fundamental principle is that if there are strong republics there will be a strong center, a strong Union. I hope that the stipulations of this draft will meet with the attention of the congress and the Supreme Soviet which, I assume, will consider such problems, as well as with the understanding of Union economic departments. Speaking of the status of a Union republic within the USSR and of upgrading economic autonomy, problems of state-legal guarantees of this sovereignty on the Union level are bound to appear. Unfortunately, our common history dating from Stalinist times has led to the development of a number of tangles of mistrust among republics. This complicates on the sociopolitical level the implementation of radical reforms in all areas of Union activities.

One such tangle is problems of the historical circumstances under which the Lithuanian SSR was established. We know that the 1939 treaty between the USSR and Germany and the secret protocol attached to it predetermined at that time the fate of the independent Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian republics. After they became public knowledge, these historical facts and documents triggered sharp political discussions which led to an enhancement of the emotional tension and stress. Vagueness on this matter greatly weakens the positions of the Lithuanian Communist Party. We need an official governmental declaration which would provide a political assessment of these international documents. Restructuring and the process of creating a rule of law state, which are taking place, simply demand the condemnation of the power methods used by Stalinist foreign policy. The open acknowledgment of the illegality of said concept is necessary. This must be accomplished for the sake of historical justice and for the sake of the future of the Lithuanian and the other Baltic nations (applause), the more so since we are on the eve of the 50th anniversary of the signing of these treaties. This will not only help to increase trust and the cohesion of the peoples within the USSR but will also enhance its international reputation. It will also help the more extensive participation of Union republics in shaping and exercising Soviet foreign policy. A faulty practice has developed in which the interests of Union republics abroad in the areas of economics, culture, science, and other are represented by numerous central departments which frequently do not study or not even have the possibility of understanding such needs and their specifics. Based on the announced new thinking in international affairs, specific business relations must be established with the positive segment of the emigres. To this effect we must involve more extensively representatives of Union republics in diplomatic work, particularly in countries in which many of our compatriots live. The Union republics must be given the opportunity to establish with them direct consular relations in the immediate future. The formulation and implementation of an active, flexible, and differentiated foreign and domestic policy, which would combine the Union interests with those of the individual republics, is a most important factor for further progress in restructuring and renovation in the country.

The government established by Lenin was considered the best educated and most intelligent in the world for its time. It successfully solved the very difficult problems of the establishment of the state. We could say without exaggerating that today we have a highly educated and very active deputy membership. This instills the hope that today's most difficult problems as well will be resolved successfully. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Deputy Yuriy Petrovich Vlasov, Moscow, has the floor. Deputy Masaliyev will be the next speaker.

Yu.P. Vlasov, writer, Moscow (Lyublinskiy Territorial Electoral District, RSFSR): Dear chairman and deputies, I represent Lyublinskiy Rayon in Moscow. From a dacha suburb it has become one of the most unhealthy areas. Dozens of plants are concentrated here, one of which is the AZLK.

The air over the rayon is polluted, and so is its water. Swimming in the river is dangerous. All standards of hygiene have been violated. Nonetheless, recently a cement elevator was completed, and an asphalt-concrete plant is under construction. What are the people to breathe? The smoke from the smokestacks?

The housing problem is grave.... Briefly, this is one of the most deprived areas of Moscow. A casting-machine plant, the main production process of which has not changed since prerevolutionary times, operates in the center of the rayon. This is a crime against the workers, the women in particular, and a crime against all of Moscow.

The state has become accustomed to take from the people their strength and health, offering stingy, sometimes insulting, and extremely miserly compensations. This applies to wages, pensions, and medical facilities. Incidentally, the price of drugs, in general, should be reduced, immediately at that. Occasionally, the people have no money to pay for medicines.

We are proclaiming great principles but essentially we are exploiting the people. The people are totally fed up with promises of a better life and firmly demand change. The worker does not wish to allow and will not allow any further decline in the living standard. That is why we are here. For the time being, the people still have faith in us. The people do not demand a great deal. They want one thing only: to be treated like human beings.

Dear deputies, I am not an economist. The main topic of my address is the democratization of our life. Democracy can feed and clothe us as really as does economics. This is natural, for these two phenomena are organically

interlinked. Democracy provides scope for life. It develops economic relations. As to the way democracy is being depicted as a scarecrow, this is a different matter.

My address has not been prescribed by anyone. I have not attended the meetings of the Moscow group. Nor do I like meetings. This statement is not one of the semi-finished products mentioned by Deputy Gorbachev in connection with the Moscow group. However, I am part of the Moscow group and with the Moscow group. This is a fact, and I am proud of it!

Here is another minor remark: Due to the fact that on Saturday, 27 May, we finished our work relatively early, I had the opportunity to watch the television report (not a newscast, but the report) on the congress. On that day the speech by Yuriy Nikolayevich Afanasyev was the focal point of the day. His speech and the speech by Deputy Popov and all speeches in support of their statements were given in their abridged versions—that is, with substantial gaps. It was very difficult to gain a clear logical concept of their views. Conversely, the opposite viewpoint was presented in detail, speech after speech by the deputies themselves.

I am addressing myself to those who are in charge of the "Time" Program. Are you not aware that this is a distortion? This is what you are reporting in that same program, on that same day and hour, about 62 percent of the people who, according to a survey, are against blocking the motions of the Moscow group by the congress. And, as you report this, you immediately engage in a forgery, i.e., you stand up against the majority of the people, against these same 62 percent.

I am not a supporter of division. However, it would be erroneous to think that any kind of malice is encouraging a division within the congress. Things are simpler: To any action there is an opposite reaction. In this case this is a reciprocal process.

Incidentally, let me make yet another remark. The position of chairman of Gosteleradio is so important that it would be difficult to overestimate it. The influence of television on the mind is striking and comprehensive. There is no more powerful means of restructuring than that. We must consent to the appointment of someone to, let us say, a responsible position such as chairman of the Constitutional Supervision Committee. I suggest that such consent should also include any candidate for the position of Gosteleradio chairman. (Applause). Such an appointment must be the prerogative—that is, the exclusive right of the congress. For the same reasons I suggest that the position of editor in chief of IZVESTIYA be made the prerogative of the congress. (Applause). Such important positions should not be left to be handled by the apparat.

We agreed not to mention the Tbilisi event until the report of the commission, which ties our hands. All right, we can postpone expressing our views and wait. However, another fact emerges in this tragic history, which should not be kept silent. From the very first days of the proceedings of the congress here, in the hall, there has been a mute question addressed to the leading governmental and party officials in the country: Who issued the order of reprisals? The answer by Deputy Gorbachev led to the need for setting up the present commission. Under no circumstances can we allow for the head of state to be unfamiliar with all the circumstances of the matter. Otherwise what kind of head of state is he? It is equally impossible to assume that to this day the members of the Politburo remain uninformed about this matter.

Please note that no one has answered the persistent questions which have been asked by probably a good dozen of deputies, although the silence itself is an answer. (Applause). No, it is not a question of concealing an important fact from the Congress of People's Deputies. It is a question of something else: of the need to include in our Constitution articles on impeachment, i.e., of depriving the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of his plenary powers because of concealing the truth from the people. (Applause). What I am saying is of essential significance for the future. The head of state must fully know who he is with: with the corporations or with the people. (Applause).

Now as to the responsibility of the government. This was already mentioned. Fears were expressed here caused by the fact that for 10 hours we were without a ruling authority, until the head of state had been elected. During those hours the country was under the threat of possible attack. Most of us realized who Brezhnev was and the way he ruled the country. Lack of principle and complicity in illegal actions and frequently fear forced the people to keep silent and not to consider the possible difficulties, although one of them turned into the misfortune of war. Brezhnev could have been absent not 10 hours but 10 years and hardly anyone would have noted this.

During those years the overwhelming majority of the present members of the Politburo and the members of the government held quite high positions. However, as you know, today all responsibility is written off with a single capacious sentence: "All of us have come out of those times." I categorically disagree with this. Not all! However, I am not talking about this now. Restructuring started 4 years ago and everything that is taking place in the country now is largely the result of the direct activities of our leadership. This richest country in the world is using vouchers, which are the equivalent of rationing cards, in time of peace. Even the most basic staple products are lacking. Our ruble is pitiful compared to any other currency. There is a great deal of corruption, illegality, and arbitrariness in the country. The country is drowning in irresponsible decisions. A great country has been humiliated. It cannot sink any lower, for if it were

this would mean disintegration. Usually, individuals who are responsible for such a turn of affairs resign, not singly but as a group, as people who have made a mess of things. (Applause). In any case, that is the custom the world over.

It was said here that normal activities by the government are impossible without strict control. The Supreme Soviet has such rights. It is the executive, the managing authority. The deputies must ask how to pose questions.... they must pose questions to the government. For example, each 2 or 3 weeks the government would report at the sessions about its activities and in front of the television cameras about domestic and foreign policy, economics, and various appointments. There should be no secrets from the people. And everyone must appear in front of them as he truly is.

As we can see, even with the present turn of affairs, the government will not submit its resignation. There are serious reasons for this: The power based on the entire apparat system has always supported the supreme authority.

How could Brezhnev rule our country? No, it was not Brezhnev who ruled. He was merely the symbol. What ruled was force. It was established in our country as the only legal norm. Force, fear, intolerance, and cruelty... imbued our lives and were the nerve of life which are still preventing us to stand tall to this day.

There is intolerance in this hall as well, as a mark of all those years. It is found in the catcalls and aspiration to shut the speaker's mouth. To the people restructuring (along with surmounting the economic crisis) means the elimination of the apparat system. This system developed entirely on the basis of the suppression of the individual and the rightlessness of everyone in particular; rightlessness and, consequently, defenselessness. We have had in our lives all too many lies.

Yes, there is glasnost today but the fact that it was given to us as a gift will not make us freeze in a state of grateful reverence. Democracy must be developed.

It is the guarantee of our strength and, above all, our future.

We cannot, we must not make our future dependent on the moral qualities of a single individual. We must give the people democratic management based on the law and surmount the economic crisis. This is possible only if we establish an efficient legislative right, the right to make demands on people who are here, in this hall, representing the government. We must address demands to them and to those who are behind them. This will be the demand of the people. (Applause).

From the address of a group of voters: "The weekly SEMYA and Central Television described and showed the places where the victims of mass repressions were buried. They included the Don cemetery and the Kalitnikovskoye and Rogozhskoye cemeteries in Moscow. In the place where the dust of tens of thousands of our fellow citizens was buried, on 6 January of this year, at a meeting with workers in science and culture at the CPSU Central Committee, Comrade Gorbachev said that we must single out these places, put them in order, and erect monuments. A respective CPSU Central Committee resolution was passed. However, no real steps to this effect were taken in our city. Why? The search led to other places as well, where there were thousands of skulls and bones. We must honor the memory of our fellow citizens who were the victims of excesses and executions. These were tens of thousands of innocent people who were executed. The history of mankind knows of no other such crimes. Unquestionably, a substantial help in the further investigation could be provided by the files of the KGB. To this day, however, they are tightly sealed. Meanwhile, hundreds of thousands of our families are unable to pay their respects to the memory of unjustly executed or tortured individuals. Is it not time to settle this matter?..."

In order to restrict the power of the apparat, we must organize control by the people over one of the powerful principles of its viability. One wing of the KGB protects the people from external enemies while another, incomparably more powerful, is engaged in a separate specific function. No, I do not have in mind the struggle against corruption. After the hard lessons of the past, after millions of people killed, all of them without exception with the direct involvement of the Cheka-MGB, to this day the threats to democracy must not be considered mythical.

Under the circumstances of the initial steps on the road to democracy and, at the same time, the desire to suppress, it, a power such as the KGB assumes a particular meaning, for the KGB obeys the apparat alone; the KGB has been taken out of the control by the people. It is the most concealed, the most secret of all governmental institutions. Naturally, I do not even think of casting aspersions on the personnel of this department. I am speaking of its role in our life.

Deep secrecy, justified as a feature of its occupation, ensures the actual lack of control over the KGB, although its actions are sometimes quite questionable. No truth can be found in the course of such clashes with the KGB. To seek the truth is dangerous. Manipulations involving alleged mental abnormality can to this day threaten the people who present a danger to the apparat.

The democratic renovation of the country has not changed the position of the KGB in the political system. This committee provides comprehensive control over society and over every separate individual. Within the system of ministerial relations, it clearly stands above the state, obeying only a narrow group of the apparat. The appointment of the chairman of the KGB must go through the Congress of People's Deputies. The people's

deputies must know the size of this organization and demand accountability for all violations of the law and be familiar with its budget. (Applause). It would also be better to move the KGB service from Dzerzhinskiy Square. We have quite an unforgettable bloody history of the main building where the "sword defending the people" rests. From here for decades orders were issued for the destruction or persecution of millions of people. Grief, moaning, and pain were sown by this service over our native land. Within this building people were tortured and hurt, people who, as a rule, were the best, the pride, and the flower of our nations. The very complex of these buildings, so unexplainably monumentally huge, somehow confirm who in reality holds the power in the country. Such a complex is unsuitable for the center of Moscow. It would be fair for the KGB to surrender these buildings (the need for premises in our city is tremendous) perhaps baking them a book repository, and build a modest building for itself in the suburbs, but not one like its hospital in Pokrovskoye-Streshnevo. This hospital is surrounded by a pine forest and is an ultramodern huge building, linked by subway to the center. Next to it is the rayon tuberculosis hospital, which is simply a wretched building. The KGB is not a service but a real underground empire which has as yet not surrendered its secrets, for the deepest ones have only been identified. Despite such a past, this service maintains its special, its exclusive status. It is the most powerful of all the existing instruments of the apparat. It is unequal in terms of efficiency and impeccable functioning. A Defense and State Security Commission is being planned under the Supreme Soviet. Let us hope that this will deal with the activities of the MVD and KGB (the MVD as well has not left the best of traces in our history). This commission must be given a new content and engage in efficient control. This is one of the essential tasks which, it is true, would be difficult to accomplish both by the USSR Supreme Soviet and the future Congresses of People's Deputies.

The voters in my district have yet another appeal which I received yesterday. It deals with state statistics. "The Congress of People's Deputies believes that in recent years the USSR State Committee for Statistics was one of the state organizations whose activities contributed to the manipulating of public opinion with false figures which embellished reality. To this day the USSR State Committee for Statistics has not shown its ability to reduce the flow of questionable accountability which the state authorities impose upon enterprises and establishments. The congress resolves (a draft motion) the following: to set up a commission of people's deputies within the framework of the Supreme Soviet to determine the true situation of affairs in the economy, particularly in establishing the true dynamics of the national income, inflation processes, size of monetary emissions, growth of labor productivity, and reduction of the state apparatus. The people must be informed of the results of the commission."

The election of people's deputies not every 5 but 3 years is of essential significance. Such elections must be universal, direct, and secret. The political development of the people is maintaining a pace such that the present composition of the congress will no longer reflect such changes and, metaphorically speaking, the "5-year term" will block a number of important decisions which are so necessary for the people.

We have reached a critical point in our development.

Petr Chaadayev, an original Russian philosopher and friend of Pushkin wrote 150 years ago: "We are an exceptional people. We are one of those nations which somehow are not part of mankind but exist only for the sake of teaching the world some kind of terrible lesson...."

There should no longer be any more "terrible lessons." (Applause).

Let me now say a few words on yesterday's ovations heard in the hall on the use of force in Tbilisi. It is criminal to kill for convictions. Slogans and political alienation, speaking of dissidence, cannot be justifications for murder. Such a position comes close to the one which led our country to commit murders unparalleled in the world and which we are still unable to comprehend with our minds and consciences. After these ovations it is clear to me that a separation is virtually inevitable; more things divide than unite us. These are differences in understanding the very foundations of life. (Sustained applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Deputy Masaliyev has the floor.

A.M. Masaliyev, first secretary, Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee (Issyk-Kulskiy Territorial Electoral District, Kirghiz SSR): Dear people's deputies, our electorate expects of us sensible approaches to the solution of the pressing problems, a surfeit of which have accumulated in all areas of life. Things will not improve as a result of emotions, meetings or malicious speeches. We need practical actions. This was mentioned in the report submitted by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and in the speeches of many deputies. I fully agree with them.

Inasmuch as the entire power is transferred to the soviets, naturally the role and responsibilities of the USSR Supreme Soviet and its standing authorities will increase. What to do for the Supreme Soviet to exert a real influence on improving the social atmosphere and accelerating the solution of socioeconomic problems? All of us must think about this. Strictly speaking, this is precisely the purpose of the reform in the political system.

I would like to express my own considerations. Bearing in mind that the Congress of People's Deputies will meet twice annually, we should review both the nature and duration of the work of the Supreme Soviet and the

congresses, and establish the term and length of the spring and autumn sessions. As to the permanent commissions and committees, they should work as much as is necessary in order thoroughly to prepare the various items before submitting them to the Supreme Soviet.

In my view, two congresses and two sessions annually is excessive. The main thing in the work of the supreme authority, as of the congress, should be greater practicality and concreteness and common sense. In this case a great deal depends on us, deputies. For the time being, emotional discussions rather than practical thoughts predominate.

Here is another problem related to the authority of the deputies and the activities of the Supreme Soviet. It affects work with motions and critical remarks submitted by the deputies. We need an efficient mechanism for their summation, evaluation, and consideration, such that no single suggestion submitted by a people's deputy is ignored. Such a mechanism could be provided, for example, by a specially created Supreme Soviet commission or, perhaps, a commission of the congress, which would consider all suggestions submitted by deputies and issue respective recommendations on their development and application and supervise their practical implementation. Such an approach would largely prevent formal replies, as was the case in the past. The people would like to see their deputies not only as people who criticize one and all but also who are actively working and making their personal contributions to restructuring, to solving the problem of food supplies to the population and organizing the implementation of resolutions and laws which we have been entrusted to pass.

Let me say a few words on relations among nationalities. This matter, actually, is a most complex, touchy, and, let us frankly say, insufficiently studied. As we already pointed out, it will be considered at the Central Committee plenum. It is natural that a great deal of attention to this problem has been paid by the congress as well. As we know, on the initiative of the party's Central Committee and with the active participation of all areas of the country, a search is under way for constructive approaches aimed at uniting society and broadening the sovereignty and independence of the republics. We, deputies representing the Kirghiz SSR, support these steps and hope that they will be embodied in specific legal acts. Above all, it is necessary to settle on a just basis relations in the realm of economics, both between the republic and the center as well as among Union republics. A great deal of distortions exist in this area. For example, a one-sided economic development based on extracting and raw material sectors has developed in Kirghizia, adversely affecting the shaping of the budget and the solution of social problems. In connection with preparations by the Republic for converting to cost accounting and self-management, we must thoroughly consider and solve all such problems. It is our profound conviction that the way of the further development of nations and nationalities passes not through isolation but through organically combining republic autonomy with national interests. Indeed, a strong Union means strong republics and a strong center, and sincere trust and reciprocal respect by our peoples toward each other. That is why as we solve our regional problems we, people's deputies, nonetheless must remember our tremendous responsibility to our descendants in protecting the cohesion of the multinational land of the soviets. For different approaches would, in the final account, cause serious harm to each region and its ethnic groups. Lenin taught us to approach each phenomenon specifically and historically. Taking this into consideration, we believe that at the present difficult stage in the country's development, it is important to focus our efforts not on revising existing national-state forms or remapping the territory of one republic or another, for this would destroy the existing economic relations and result in new economic difficulties, more than enough of which already exist in our country. Naturally, the problems of the republics must be considered and resolved. Today we must establish order in the local areas. Moscow will not do this for us. Each republic has major opportunities and rights to surmount many manifestations of social injustice, to eliminate distortions in its linguistic policy, and to develop culture, education, and other areas.

I cannot avoid the question of democratization of our social life. Unquestionably, the democratic processes taking place are major gains of restructuring. They should be welcomed and consolidated. Nonetheless, we must not forget even for a minute the need to strengthen conscious discipline. Unfortunately, we have unjustifiably weakened this important work. It is no accident that on the crest of the wave of democracy extremist elements have emerged, which are fanning nationalistic moods and deliberately undermining the authority of the Soviet state and the Communist Party and its policy and ideology. As the facts confirm, here and there matters have reached the level of blasphemous encroachments on values we consider sacred. There have been appeals to "turn back from October to February." Aspersions have been cast even on Lenin.

Yes, we can only agree with Comrade Yeltsin in that during the years of restructuring problems of improving food supplies to the population have not been solved; there is a scarcity of housing and goods. Nonetheless, all of us are adults. We understand that such difficult problems cannot be solved in 4 years. All deputies must be well familiar with this fact. However, to say that "nothing has been done and the present composition of the Central Committee and the government will be unable to solve the problems," although this sound attractive to the naive, remains, nonetheless, unfair. There have been changes in the economy, culture, and other areas. Is this not confirmed by the past elections and the proceedings of our congress? (Applause).

Speculating on democracy, some individuals are building their political careers by defaming noted party and state leaders, using to this effect the press, television, and

radio which, as the deputies have said, are not always objective. To a certain extent they have been able to develop in the society a negative attitude toward the personnel of party committees as being bureaucratic. Naturally, they include bureaucrats and irresponsible people but are such people also not found among the intelligentsia and among people working in other areas of activity? The party apparatus as well suffers from many shortcomings and distortions. This was accurately mentioned by the deputies. We must draw conclusions: We must more rapidly restructure the style and methods of its work and achieve real results. However, we also see that in addition to the criticism of the apparatus, a frontal attack has been mounted against the party, and Lenin's stipulation that no single party could exist even a single day without an apparat is being rejected. We hope that the Law on the Press, which is now being drafted, will define the rights and obligations of the personnel of the mass information media and will help those who, to repeat Lenin's words, cloud their mind with the freedom of the press, with its brilliant swamp fire (see "*Poln. Sobr. Soch.*" [Complete Collected Works], vol 44, p 83), preaching a so-called "pure democracy," and trying to take the press out of control. In our society, as Comrade Gorbachev has frequently repeated, all agencies, public organizations, and leading party and state personalities must be controlled by the people. In recent years some economists have become firmly "established" in newspapers and journals. They regularly speak on television and discuss failures in the economy and financial difficulties. This is being discussed at the congress. However, no sensible solution to the situation is being offered. Do they live outside society? (Applause).

Voice from the hall: They do make suggestions.

A.M. Masaliyev: You are making suggestions but we, the sovereign Kirghiz Republic, have not seen a single scientist during those years. We have not received a single suggestion from you. (Applause). It is time for all of us to join efforts and develop a constructive basis for our activities, directing them to the practical solution of topical problems.

As you and I know, a difficult situation is developing in a number of areas. This is seriously influencing the country's sociopolitical atmosphere. Let us frankly say that in frequent cases the various groups and associations which have appeared here cause social conflicts and instigate the people to engage in confrontation with the party and soviet authorities and provoke the development of relations among nationalities in dangerous ways, involving the population in a "democracy by meetings," and calling for strikes. All of this is doing tremendous harm to restructuring and causes suffering to the toiling people.

Some people have shown such a great liking for meetings and demonstrations that even during the proceedings of the congress they have not put a stop to them. Why? For what purpose? It is clear that it is not for the sake of consolidating the society but for increasing political tension. It is as though the worse it is for the country, the better it is for them. Yet, today all opportunities exist to consider and solve any arising conflicts calmly and efficiently at each enterprise where councils of labor collectives have been created on a democratic basis, headed by authoritative people. Other democratic instruments to this effect exist as well.

We heard in this hall voices calling for the creation of factions even among the corps of deputies. This, too, is presented as a requirement of democracy. This is the first time that people have truly experienced democracy, but there are already those who would like to turn it into anarchy and describe the ukases passed by the Supreme Soviet Presidium for purposes of bringing order, antidemocratic. Possibly such legislative acts may be as yet imperfect. However, in the interest of the overwhelming majority of the people they must be functional and we support them. (Applause).

Finally, some speakers, as we already mentioned, have accused the deputies from the Central Asian republics as being obedient and voting as a block for everything. To say the least, this is not serious. Let us not impose our unacceptable opinions on others.

In turn, we would like for Moscow, the capital of the USSR, and for Leningrad, the cradle of the October revolution, to be in the vanguard of the struggle for restructuring and for the communists, the working class, and the intelligentsia of these the largest economic, scientific, and cultural centers, to set the example of organization and order. We hope that the Moscow and Leningrad groups of deputies will also work in this direction. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Deputy Bunich has the floor.

P.G. Bunich, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and faculty chief at the Moscow S. Ordzhonikidze Institute of Management (from the USSR Academy of Sciences): Esteemed chairman, esteemed deputies! Society is currently showing an unprecedented interest in our congress. This upsurge of interest is the first since the celebrated Congress of Soviets that adopted the Decrees on Peace and Land. The country has declared a kind of sit-down strike—everyone who can goes to work, but does no work; everyone watches television. This is not a show; it reflects the fact that the people pin their hopes on us. And this hope is, for us, a supreme law, higher even than the Constitution.

No one expects us to do everything immediately, to resolve all the problems at once. All we have to do is to move the ship off the sandbank. It has been said here that if you pull on the right-hand oar, you go to the left, and if you pull on the left-hand oar, you go to the right. It seems to me that if the ship is sitting on a sandbank

and some people on the extreme right and left start rowing and waving their oars about, it will not move from the spot at all, it will only sink in more deeply. And even overturn.

But when the economic interest of every person throughout our society is involved, and when every person, by virtue of that interest, jettisons the huge ballast that weighs him down, the ship will set off on course for the first time. Then we will gain high world rankings in terms of prosperity, and will lose the high world rankings that we would like to lose.

In particular, we hold one of the highest rankings in the world in terms of expenditure and recovery of oil. We rank first in the world, perhaps, in terms of percentage plan fulfillment. Where we are rich is in this percentage, rather than in what lies behind it. We hold a high world ranking in the number of resolutions, and their length is unique. An enormous number of managers work on these resolutions and according to them. We now hold, so to speak, clear leading positions in waiting lines, the number of people carrying bags, the size of each bag, and the quantity of air it holds. In the attempt to rectify matters we deprive ourselves even of the dubious distinction of leadership in terms of rallies.

Since restructuring began we have constantly acknowledged that it is going slowly, and we have even worked out a formula: more slowly than we would like. This formula is inadequate, although it is a bit better than the one we had before, when we used to profess the concept of isolated shortcomings. Everyone knows that there is no such thing as an isolated shortcoming.

However, all this does nothing to make us more radical. In the sphere of foreign relations we have clear, acknowledged achievements. In the sphere of glasnost the congress itself testifies that here too we have achievements. But in the economic sphere our changes have been almost exclusively cosmetic.

I would like to name some of these. There are the state orders, which are not state orders at all, but are only a camouflaged, inferior name for the old state targets. There is pseudo-wholesale trade, pseudo-self-financing instead of real self-financing. There are the concerns, which in principle should differ from ministries, but in practice are no different. There is marketing, which we have begun to talk about a lot now and to call for, forgetting that in any marketing textbook the first line is this: Trade arises when supply is greater than demand.

But that is not all. There is evidence of a backlash, especially in recent times. A clear trend has developed to manage the economy by means of bans, a trend toward bans rather than incentives. And this is done in the guise of emergency measures. Many examples could be cited. Two of them: The normative relationship between the growth of labor productivity and the average wage, which was introduced in its strict form comparatively recently. As everyone is well aware, this has done no good. In my view this measure is fundamentally inadequate, because our inflation has deeper roots. Then there is the "shooting down" of the cooperative system that occurs, the vacillation, whereby first we create privileged conditions for it, then we start inflicting undeserved wounds.

The real emergency measures, in my view, are simply radical measures. It is necessary to begin a real reform, not to engage in emergency measures, as we have been doing for all the years of Soviet power, including the last 4 years. And when we are called upon to adopt solely these draconian measures, personally it frightens me. I am afraid that the really important creative work will not take place at the same time, and once again the most important thing will be postponed. The main shortage is the shortage of radical measures, both as regards their formulation, and even more, I would say, as regards their implementation.

Who is to blame? There are people who say that implementing the NEP [new economic policy] was all very well. At that time people were, so to speak, not yet genetically ruined; at that time the fire of enterprise was still in them, they had not yet forgotten that they can be the masters, that they can show initiative.

It is claimed that we are in a far worse position now. Perhaps that is true, but I think at least that it is a gross exaggeration to say that people have lost the proprietorial sense. This sense can be revived very rapidly, and the cooperative system is the proof. Perhaps that system has not yet assembled all the best people, perhaps the decent person has only half-heartedly joined in as yet, but nonetheless we can see what energy this form of activity shows.

They say that economic leaders are to blame. I wish to say that those to whom reform is advantageous cannot be to blame. It is advantageous to the people, and on the whole it is advantageous to economic leaders. And today, in any case, it is not a question of economic leaders. Because even if they very badly wanted revolutionary changes, they can do virtually nothing. Nearly everything is simply forbidden for them. In the future we will indeed come up against the problem of economic leaders of enterprises, and also the training of collectives. And that will be perhaps our most belatedly tackled task, and our most difficult. So who, then, is to blame?

For 4 years we have been saying (recently both party and government leaders, but first and foremost party leaders, have begun to say this) that the blame rests mainly with the central departments. More precisely, the central economic departments, which are afraid of responsibility, afraid of making radical decisions.

After all, in our country not one person has ever been penalized for going too slowly, only for going too fast. And this danger, the personal danger, holds back everything, under cover of state security.

Moreover the central economic departments are, it must be admitted, losing their position as the main component in the economy, the main component in the country, the position they held under the edict system, and even losing their places. It has been said here today and yesterday that those who came through the elections for territorial okrugs underwent great tempering and have many instructions from the voters. I must say that there were territorial elections where everything was very difficult, but there were also those where everything was very easy. There were social organizations where it was also difficult, and others where it was easy. At the Academy of Sciences, as you know, we went through purgatory. Our voters said to us that as long as the economy is in the hands of leaders like Gostev and Pavlov, restructuring will not happen. (Applause).

I should also say that there is no sign of an improvement, but everything is fine at the State Committee for Labor and Social Questions. Recently the Gosplan proposed the extension of this whole present-day existence of ours not only for the remaining 18 months of this 5-year plan, but for another 2 years. This proposal naturally met with the support of the State Committee for Construction Affairs [Gosstroy], which is now extending its "unfinished construction work" to the whole of society. I should say quite objectively that Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov did not accept these proposals, did not support them. To some extent I find that encouraging.... It is a pity that in our country it is not a crime to discredit the Soviet economy.

What is to be done?

The picture today is like this: If an enterprise makes a loss, it receives the same wages as a profitable one; if an enterprise works five times better, it receives the same wages as if it worked five times worse. That is in the state sector. Thus, the situation in the country is that we have too many who work poorly (loss-making enterprises, and officially 15 percent of our enterprises are loss-making), and if you add the low-profit ones (these are also loss-making, but in a less critical form, and I think they account for 50 percent). [sentence as published] And if you look at the profit-making enterprises, assessed by our excessive Soviet prices, and assess them by any other (world) prices, they too appear to have extremely low profits.... So all this is the reason why when a person works less well, things are better for him. He earns more per unit of labor. Therefore in our country, instead of an urge to rise up from the bottom, there is an urge to sink down to the bottom. And the vast majority of our enterprises are, to an increasing extent, lying at the bottom, where life is easy, quiet, and crowded.

This is what I would say: "He who does not work, eats him who works." That is how it is. Unfortunately we live better than we work, although we live very badly. Because we are eating our children's food. Because we are slipping into debt to other countries. Because we are ruining the ecology, because we are ruining our children's health, because we teach them badly and ruin their education. Because we are eating into the accumulations fund and at the same time technical progress, but they, the future generations, will have nothing to eat into, they will have to take more out of themselves than at present. (Applause).

The main means of resolving our problems was correctly defined 4 years ago. It is economic accountability, when everyone will know that everything he has done belongs to him, minus taxes. When everyone will know that everything he has failed to do, is at his own expense, and that socialism is not social security. And then very few will drown. Because you drown when you know that there is a life belt, when there is a state that will fish out any drowning man. When there is no life belt, everyone will swim—slowly, poorly, but they will not drown. A few will drown, but those who drown will deserve to drown. (Applause).

But instead of all this, stubbornly, with a persistence worthy of a better cause, we are introducing the first and second models of economic accountability. These are both patently old models, although they are passed off as new. Recently one speaker said on the television that there is a "big " difference between them: In the first model you measure the height of a building from the floor to the ceiling, in the second—from the ceiling to the floor. That is the only difference between them. (Applause).

But the main point is not that they are identical, but that they are identically bad. The solution is really to transfer enterprises to self-reliance [samosoderzhaniye], to relying on what they have earned. Then, at first they will have to pay turnover tax, and later tax on the wage fund, which unfortunately does not yet exist. Interest must also be paid to the bank: That is a normal phenomenon. And insurance payments must be made, not today's, but higher, and insurance against commercial risk must be introduced, which we are unfamiliar with, because no one takes any risks. But if everyone is taking risks, they will not do so without such insurance. Lease payments must also be introduced....

Incidentally, on the subject of the lease—some people are beginning to say: Let us hand over the factories to the workers. Let us hand them over. Then, people who work, for instance, in Aeroflot will receive, perhaps, a million rubles per person. And people who work at a hairdresser's will receive the scissors, and nothing else. Let us hand over this auditorium. To whom shall we hand it over when we leave? To the 10, 20, or 30 technical workers?

The country has taken taxes from all of us on identical terms, and created a common pot, but has not distributed from that pot on identical terms. And therefore we cannot hand out the property, but we should offer the opportunity to lease it, or for those who so wish, to buy it. Incidentally, leasing is a necessity, in this way, both for large enterprises and for small ones. Among agriculturalists, I have come across this view: Leasing is necessary only for the individual peasant farm. And that a large enterprise should not be leased, and that it cannot, in principle, be leased.... There is the concept of state ownership, it cannot operate in its present form. The property cannot be handed out. So the lease system remains wherever there is state ownership.

Then, after the lease, everything should belong to the collective alone. It can no longer be tied by any strings from above. (Incidentally, these strings from above remind me of the rope, the noose.) But all this is only possible on one condition: that the enterprise is absolutely autonomous, not partially, but absolutely. This does not mean that we are such ignorant people as to propose a free market. It is simply that in present-day conditions the market always incorporates the role of the state. The relationship changes, there is a castling move: At the bottom is the market, the basis is the market, and everything that the market cannot do or does worse than the state—all this is done by the state by market methods, methods that do not damage, break, or destroy our main strength—the strength of economic accountability.

Finally I would like to say that in the near future nonstate property will clearly arise at every state enterprise. After all, if I am on a lease system and I have a development fund that I have earned, after paying to the state everything I owe to it, the projects I have built from that fund are mine. That is, cooperative, or joint-stock, property arises, which will be distributed on the basis of shares. Everyone will have an interest in accumulations, everyone will really strive not to eat up everything today, but to set something aside for the future.

Another thing: Say I take out a loan. I use it to build a shop, a plant, whatever you like. Whose is it? Mine, and mine alone. Say I lease a tractor for 5 years. It does 7 years' service. For 2 years it is absolutely mine.... I want to emphasize this idea of creating cooperative ownership simultaneously at every state enterprise. And as long as our Ministry of Finance does not stifle the enterprises with savage taxes or eat up this development fund, we will indeed have this hybrid, strong combination.

This restores the individual's interest. And that is the most important thing. It could all be legalized in a single law on the enterprise and the cooperative, which Mikhail Sergeyevich has spoken of. The new general law should be based on the Law on the Cooperative System, which is viable. But today, when two different laws exist, the cooperative system is to some extent plundering the state sector.

Different blood groups cannot be compatible. The healthy ruble, the living ruble, will conquer the dead ruble of our sleeping bear, our state sector. And the people will flee the state sector. After just over a year there are 2 million people in the cooperative system, as against 150,000 before. The state sector lost 1 million of these.

They are not the worst people, they are those who can go, and those who do not go stay behind and grumble at the cooperative system. (Applause). If a girl leaves her fiance for another, the likelihood is that the first boyfriend's hidden flaws were to blame. Therefore we should not curse the cooperative system, but impose order in the cooperative system—that is the first thing. And when that order has been created, extend it to the state sector. That is the second thing.

Whose idea was all this? I have heard it said here that it was the Muscovites' idea. I am all in favor of the Muscovites, I would have great pleasure in agreeing that it was our idea. But it was mankind's idea, it came from his wise experience, including the experience of socialist development. Remember our own NEP, remember China, and much more besides.

It is now planned that we should go on living for another 18 months in this system. But please, tell me this, if we can go over to a new system in 18 months' time, why do we have to wait for 18 months? What is there that we cannot do today? (Applause). Is it not enough that we have already been waiting for 3 and ½ years?

At the beginning of that time, a dilemma was proclaimed—the 5-year plan or restructuring. The useless 5-year plan, or proper restructuring. And then we chose the 5-year plan. I propose—and I proposed this before, some years ago—that we begin to introduce restructuring without delay. Mikhail Sergeyevich has said that many things must be done during this 5-year plan. That is a new position, because formerly it was proposed to postpone everything to the next 5-year plan. Let us at once give the Ministry of Finance one last chance, let us give it 6 months to set things to rights, let it introduce all the necessary taxes and remove the remaining regulators of our economic life. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Comrade Makhramov has the floor. Comrade Toome will be the next speaker.

K. Makhkamov, first secretary, Tadzhik Communist Party Central Committee, Dushanbe (Dushanbe Territorial Electoral District, Tadzhik SSR): Comrade chairman, comrade deputies, as a USSR people's deputy, representing the interests of the voters of the capital of Tadzhikistan, I support the idea of the formula for the development of the Soviet federation: "strong center—strong republics." Nonetheless, I would like to express some considerations on the practical implementation of this profoundly meaningful thesis.

Of late the press has published a number of materials on the restructuring of economic relations among the individual regions in the country. These and many other official discussions quite clearly reveal the thought that the so-called "raw material" republics are silently boycotting the application of the principles of territorial cost accounting. I emphasize, the principles. This is radically untrue. Although we support as a whole the concepts of self-financing and self-management of the republics, nonetheless their implementation mandatorily must meet three conditions:

First. Mandatory reform of wholesale and purchase prices.

Second. Conversion to the principles of cost accounting only on a nationwide basis. On this level we believe accurate the view expressed at the congress about the impossibility of solving basic economic problems within the boundaries of separate economic units. Third and final. The creation of a legal foundation in the guise of a law on economic relations among territories within the system of the state federation.

I believe that we would hardly be able to achieve our objective without solving these three problems. We know that of late ecology has become one of the greatest concerns of the press, radio, and television. Along with a number of sectors of the national economy, it is quite frequently related to hydraulic power construction. The significance of ecological problems, naturally, is not denied by anyone. However, society cannot do without the steady increase in a power base. This, too, is axiomatic.

In the next few years more than 150,000 new jobs must be created in the republic to ensure the employment of ever increasing manpower resources. Under the conditions of scarcity of land, when there are no more than 0.11 hectares of irrigated land per capita, this problem can be resolved essentially through the creation of new production facilities. How can this be achieved without electric power?

In this connection, let me say a few words about the Rigun hydraulic power plant which is being built in the republic on the Vakhsh River. This construction project has triggered a number of questions and heated arguments on the height of the dam, the area to be flooded, and, in particular, the further fate of the resettled people. Currently they are being considered and solved within the framework of economic and ecological expediency. However, we must point out that for quite some time we have felt the need to review the existing rates of compensation for people resettled from flooded areas, for their gardens, vineyards, and others, for these are some of the sources of income for those people. It is no secret that these rates, which are 20 or 30 years old, are totally inconsistent with reality. We believe that the people are raising entirely justified and reasonable demands, and we have no right to ignore them.

This problem has another aspect as well. For a number of years the Republic has been unable to develop small-scale hydraulic power production. Today this problem becomes particularly relevant, and here is why: In the 1930s and 1940s, in order to solve the problem of the country's cotton independence, hundreds of thousands of people who lived in the mountain areas of the Republic were resettled in the uninhabited valleys to grow cotton. Today, when the food problem is pressing, once again we must develop the mountain territories, for which reason some of the excess population in the valleys must be resettled to the mountain areas.

Hundreds of new settlements will appear. As a rule, they will be created in the valleys bordering rivers and streams. Under these circumstances, the question is what is more expedient: to string across mountain ridges and ravines hundreds of kilometers of power cables or build local hydraulic power plants, using the energy resources provided by nature itself? We know that in many countries, such as Sweden, Austria, and others, such resources are used virtually 100 percent. I already raised this question at the 27th Party Conference. More than 3 years have passed since but not a single step forward has been taken. Apparently gigantomania and the diktat of departmental interests have not been surmounted. For the time being, the prospects in this area are discouraging. To the best of our knowledge, Minenergomash does not even intend to undertake the production of low-power hydraulic turbines. Meanwhile, in our Republic alone there is an urgent and substantiated need for the construction of 27 low-power hydroelectric power plants to serve hundreds of settlements, the population of which today is deprived of electric power and everything that it provides. I believe that this matter affects not our Republic alone, and that it must be solved on a national scale.

Let me draw the attention of the people's deputies to yet another matter, the urgency of which is steadily growing. The course of restructuring in economic relations among enterprises, territories, and sectors, based on commodity-monetary relations, is unquestionably strategically correct. By granting autonomy to labor collectives and extensively developing the variety of forms of labor organization, converting to wholesale trade and other steps would mandatorily yield and are already yielding efficient economic results. However, in addition to strategic tasks there also are problems of a tactical nature which, occasionally, require a temporary retreat in order to achieve general success. I am referring above all to the currently developing system of material and technical procurements. The point is that conversion to wholesale trade and the significant expansion of so-called direct relations are taking place today under circumstances marked by the gravest possible scarcity of the absolute majority of items. The monopoly status of suppliers is totally unrestricted. Competing companies have not been created as yet. All of this leads to an even stricter diktat exercised by the owners of scarce products, compared to the past.

The army of legitimized fixers has grown sharply and, with them, let us be honest, so has group egotism. By this I mean excessive demands made by suppliers in signing contracts for the delivery of construction materials, food, transport facilities, and others. Here is an example: In Tadzhikistan a gold mining combine is being built, the completion of the first part of which is planned for next year. Therefore, in order to ensure the completion of the project on time, equipment and materials are needed on the basis of direct relations; problems of their manufacturing and procurement within the required deadlines must be solved, involving 40 manufacturing plants of five Union ministries. What is the result? Many plants refuse to sign contracts, referring to the lack of long-term relations. How can such relations be developed by an enterprise which is only under construction? Others demand, in exchange, goods which are in particular short supply: cement, trucks, bridge cranes, rolled metal goods, and millions of rubles of contributions to the development fund.

The Gossnab enterprises are engaged in wholesale trade under conditions of limited resources, compared to the volume of work. Thus, for example, for the majority of building organizations most items are assessed in terms of "million," and it is within such a range, if one could say so, that "resources" are being sold. You must agree that to classify such relationship as trade is simply not serious. In this case the small enterprises and projects under construction find themselves in particularly difficult circumstances. In this connection, a motion has been filed to revise the system of material-technical procurements and, for a while, to return, for certain items, which are in extreme short supply, to a strictly centralized allocation of resources, with strict penalties for a failure to deliver items or with good incentives if contracts are fulfilled. Such a temporary retreat would be justified. It would bring success and make it possible to solve subsequently strategic problems. For in order to win, occasionally one must retreat, otherwise unfinished production will increase and assets will become frozen. Debates have been going on for nearly 20 years in the country on how to lower the volume of unfinished construction without the problem being solved. This was quite pointedly mentioned in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report. Therefore, is it not time, once and for all, to make consistent the volumes of capital investment with the available material resources in the country and thus end all debates?

Comrade deputies! In the course of the congress we have all become aware of how many complexities and acute problems have accumulated in interethnic relations. All this is a result of the fact that we were prisoners of complacency, when wishes posed as deeds. These are the serious consequences of previous times which we must all overcome together. We are convinced that this must be done by joint efforts, in an atmosphere of amicability and the ability to listen to and understand one another. In particular, we in Tajikistan are still running up against the consequences of an inadequately conceived solution for questions connected with national-territorial demarcation in Central Asia. The mistakes made then are still affecting us. There are problems which we are solving on the spot. And there are problems which we cannot solve on the spot. Here is one of them, a tiny example. Many Tajiks and some Uzbeks who live in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan have long been asking about the correcting of passport entries on nationality, because distortions were committed in the past. This problem could have been sorted out a long time ago just by amending the 1974 provision on establishing national affiliation. Back in November last year Tajik and Uzbek leaders petitioned the USSR Council of Ministers on this score. A positive conclusion was apparently arrived at by the competent bodies, but the problem still has not been resolved. At the same time we and the leaders of Uzbekistan are doing all we can so that our peoples strengthen their friendship and solve together the issues that arise. We have begun to implement a joint program of practical measures to develop interethnic links between our republics, including both economic and cultural aspects. But now, in our opinion, it is time for a more profound approach to questions of improving the national state structure on an all-union scale. In order to broaden legal guarantees and meet the national-cultural needs of citizens living outside their national state formations, or if such formations simply do not exist, it seems necessary to resolve the issue of creating, in places where there is a concentration of inhabitants of a particular nationality, national regions with their own soviets and their own representation in the republics' highest state organs. As a whole the newly formed USSR Supreme Soviet should pay particular attention to questions of interethnic relations by resolving all the arising problems in a timely and considered manner.

Comrades, yesterday a Georgian deputy raised the question about the institution of second secretaries of union republic communist party central committees. I support Deputy Ishanov on this issue. I believe that if our Georgian comrades have a problem, then let them solve it for themselves. It is not necessary to spread the problem to other republics.

In the course of the congress some deputies' speeches from this platform have contained reproaches—undeserved in my opinion, and, I hope, not just in mine—against our party. Have there been mistakes and errors on the part of the party? Yes, there have. But was it not the party that led the October revolution? Was it not the party that raised up the entire multinational Soviet people and led them to victory in the Great Patriotic War? Today it has once again started a revolutionary restructuring of society. So, comrade deputies, let us all together help the party win a new victory which will determine the future of our country and of all socialism. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Comrade Toome has the floor.

I.Kh. Toome, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Estonian SSR (Vyruskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Estonian SSR): Dear chairman and deputies: The numerous vital problems facing the country and our congress have one key problem. The critical condition of our economy, which was repeatedly mentioned here. Despite the entire difference of views and opinions, I am confident that all of us will agree that the country's economic system requires radical change. The question, however, is what type of change and to what extent such change could be the same for all parts of our huge country. The past year-year and a half have convincingly proved that the initial assumption that the country and all its areas will be restructured more or less evenly, on the basis of a single scenario, did not prove justified. However, I think that it would be also thoughtless to demand of the government of the union and the Gosplan to formulate ways and solutions for each republic, oblast or kray. We, too, must become involved and thus assume responsibility.

The deputies from the Estonian SSR came to the congress after the recently held session of the Republic's Supreme Soviet. In the area of political decisions, the session simply condemned the 1939 Hitler-Stalin agreement on the division of Europe, which sharply changed the destinies of many nations, including the Estonian. The session also deemed it necessary to address itself to the USSR Supreme Soviet with a question on the outcome of our legislative initiative and draft USSR Law on Extrajudiciary Mass Repressions of the Period of Stalinism, which was submitted as early as last December. The session turned to the USSR Congress of People's Deputies with the appeal to take steps which would exclude any possibility of a repetition of anything resembling the tragic events in Tbilisi. However, the main question discussed at our session was that of finding ways of pulling the Republic's economy out of its stagnation. Entirely in accordance with the resolutions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference we consider regional cost accounting, the economic sovereignty of the Republic, combined with full responsibility to its people and the entire country for the results of economic management and the living standard, as being such a way.

Why did the people demand of us the elaboration of a concept of cost accounting for the Estonian SSR? Why did they follow so attentively each stage of this work and participated themselves in this process actively? Because they were dissatisfied with half-heartedness, one-sidedness, and lack of comprehensiveness and of necessary radicalism in the implementation of the economic reform and the lack of tangible results from the reform. It became clear that we should not rely, as in the past, exclusively on the center to present us with ready-made decisions which would be equally consistent with both the interests of the country and the Republic, the more so since the old administrative-sectorial approach remains prevalent while the reforms are being cautious and partial. An example of this may be found in the latest notes by the USSR Council of Ministers on further improvements in national economic management. Although the idea of reducing the number of Union ministries, committees, and departments is unquestionably correct, we see here absolutely clearly the aspiration to preserve and even to strengthen centralized management and to intensify the sectorial principle. The intention is to simplify the management structure essentiall through the redistribution of the same old functions.

I believe that by now it is clear to everyone that the existing supercentralized economic mechanism has totally exhausted its possibilities, for which reason it has no future whatsoever. Any efforts at preserving it, whatever arguments may be brought forth, could only lead to an aggravation of the economic and political situation both in the country at large and in its individual areas.

We are convinced that a radical restructuring of the economy can be based only on the principle of decentralization of management, republic sovereignty, and regional self-management and self-financing. For the time being, our critics are unable to offer any sensible alternative to this idea.

The Estonian SSR formulated its cost accounting concept with the participation of Republic scientists and many major scientific centers in the country, economic managers, jurists, and practical specialists, prior to its approval by the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet; it successfully passed the strict test of nationwide discussion. The session approved and is submitting as legislative initiative for your consideration the draft USSR Law on the Conversion of the Estonian SSR to Republic Cost Accounting, related to the concept. Such documents reflect the readiness of the Estonian people to assume full responsibility for the efficient management of the Republic's economy and, thereby, for increasing its contribution to the solution of union-wide problems.

Why is it that these questions cannot wait until the next congress? Above all because the idea of republic cost accounting involved in the revolutionary restructuring of society the broad masses, which consider any delay with the introduction of cost accounting a deliberate obstruction of popular initiative. Second, we intend to start the cost accounting system as of 1 January 1990 and this must be preceded by tremendous preparatory work which cannot be initiated without a legislative base. The deputies who were able to study our suggestions may have noticed that the concept does not have anything unnatural other than the realized aspiration to combine as an entity the Republic's economy, which is today divided into sectorial fragments.

The essence of the concept, without getting into details, is that we wish to live according to our means and spend no more than what we are able to earn ourselves. This in no case means the desire somehow to separate, to lock ourselves in, to abandon all-Union concerns, as we are being accused. Such a charge, to say the least, is not serious, for a closed economy would be fatal. Conversely,

the integration among republics and areas must increase and assume a new content rather than remain based on the old distribution principles governing funds and ceilings. The Union republics and regions are a natural market for our products and for purchasing the raw materials and machines we need. On that market equal partnership must be organized instead of a diktat by departments and officials. Regional cost accounting presumes an equivalent and mutually profitable trade, which is possible only under conditions of normal direct economic relations and with the existence of an all-union market in which all of us are interested. Therefore, we shall create it!

Let me repeat once again that we do not seek any privileges for ourselves. We would like to be as poor or as rich as we truly are. This should depend exclusively on us, on the way we are able to work and to organize our economy. We would like to pay for our expenditures out of our income while, naturally, fulfilling our obligations toward the Union budget. Participation in all-Union expenditures and financing governmental development programs are an inseparable part of the budgetary outlays of a cost accounting republic. We, the people's deputies must, naturally, jointly decide how to spend such funds, the entire budget of the country, including military expenditures, and demand full budget accountability.

Cost accounting puts us in a situation in which we simply cannot afford to manage wastefully. We do not expect an easy life. Thus, the forthcoming price increase of raw materials will put the cost accounting republic in a difficult position. Nonetheless, this forces us to truly practice resource conservation and to seek ways of lowering production costs and improving quality.

There are those who tend to believe that we are trying to replace departmental diktat from the center with diktat by bureaucrats from Tallinn. We are also being suspected of wishing to restrict the legitimate rights of enterprises, particularly those under Union jurisdiction. Such is not the case. Our purpose is to reduce administrative management methods and use economic instruments in influencing economic activities without harming in any way but, conversely, expanding the autonomy of labor collectives. This has been clearly codified in our documents. The number of bureaucrats must be reduced both in the center and in the local areas and their functions should be curtailed. For example, according to our plans, internal Republic decentralization of power would allow us to reduce the number of ministries by more than one-half. We are planning to give the enterprises the full right to sell their goods independently on any market and create, on the basis of economic interests, producer associations.

Finally, we would like to close the logical chain, so that the same principles of self-management and self-financing be applicable to all of our cities and rayons and so that rights and full responsibility be delegated to their local soviets. Some of the approaches included in our documents adopted at the session are noticeably different from the general principles of self-management and self-financing which were submitted to nationwide discussion, specifically on matters of sovereignty, state budget, taxation, financial-credit policy, ownership, banking, and others. Perhaps, however, this precisely is what is good. We believe, and reality has repeatedly proved it, that if conditions are different a model applicable to all cannot be efficient. It is the republic alone which can formulate the mechanisms and forms of cost accounting consistent with its historical and cultural traditions and unique economic circumstances. Let there be several models of cost accounting simultaneously functioning in the country. In any case, variety is better than uniformity. In our view, in order to sum up the study of this comprehensive experience and, on this basis, to formulate a strategy for the economic development of the entire country, a Supreme Soviet committee for economic policy should be set up. In the structure for deputy commissions and committees suggested to us no such committee is included.

Union ministries and departments have already given us their initial response to our documents. There is a great deal in them that they do not like. We can understand that but cannot agree with them. We want radical changes and see no other way for converting from the mechanism for economic management of a formally sovereign republic to a mechanism of economic management of a truly sovereign republic. It is only under the conditions of true sovereignty of Union republics that our Union, rallied by the unity of interests and objectives, can be strong. Sovereignty and equality are the foundations for reciprocal respect and trust which cannot exist between those who are equal and those who are more equal than others. For that reason our Republic has submitted the legislative initiative which calls for including in the agenda of the congress and, subsequently adopt, a USSR Law on the Conversion of the Estonian SSR to Republic Cost Accounting (Economic Independence). Such a law should provide the necessary legal guarantees so that as of 1 January 1990 the Republic could work and live in a new way. This will meet the interests of our Republic as well as those of the entire country.

Our congress has been called upon to become a congress which must create the future aspect of the Union. Its main task is to formulate constructive nonstandard decisions. That is why, dear deputies, we trust that you will give us your support. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Dear deputies, according to our agenda, today the debates were scheduled to end at 1830. We have still not heard speakers from Moldavia and Turkmeniya. A motion has been filed to let them speak tomorrow morning. So? The congress agrees. It will be necessary, in order to formulate the draft decree on this

matter, to choose an editorial commission. Deputy Azizbekov has the floor to submit a motion on the structure of that commission. Please.

P.A. Azizbekov, director of the history museum of Azerbaijan, Baku (Baku-Azizbekovskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Azerbaijan SSR): The editorial commission in charge of formulating the draft resolution of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, based on the report submitted by the USSR Supreme Soviet chairman "On Basic Directions in the Domestic and Foreign Policy of the USSR": commission chairman: Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, CPSU Central Committee secretary. Commission members: Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin, director, USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics; Aleksandr Mikhaylovich Adamovich, director of the All-Union Scientific Research Cinematography Institute; Chingiz Aytmatov, writer, chairman of the board of the Kirghiz SSR Writers Union; Rukhi Mursal kyzy Aleskerova, chairman, executive committee, Lagichskiy Settlement Soviet of People's Deputies, Ismaillinskiy Rayon, Azerbaijan SSR; Nazhmiddin Ayubov, director of the Frunze Interkolkhoz Complex, Gissarskiy Rayon, Tadzhik SSR; Roza Atamuradovna Bazarova, chairman of the Turkmen SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Vyacheslav Aleksandrovich Borovkov, fitter, Kirovskiy Zavod Production Association, Leningrad; Vanda Sergeyevna Venglovskaya, weaver, 60-Letiya Velikoy Oktyabrskoy Sotsialisticheskoy Revolyutsii Flax Combine, Zhitomir, Ukrainian SSR; Arkadiy Ivanovich Volskiy, chairman, Committee for Special Administration of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, CPSU Central Committee department head; Grant Mushegovich Voskanyan, chairman of the Presidium of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet; Andrey Petrovich Gavrilov, editor of the newspaper VECHERNYAYA KAZAN, Tatar ASSR; Anatoliy Valeryanovich Gorbunov, chairman, Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Semen Kuzmich Grossu, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee; Tamara Nikolayevna Dudko, chairman, executive committee, Partizanskiy Rayon Soviet of People's Deputies, Minsk, Belorussian SSR; Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, CPSU Central Committee member, Moscow; Lev Nikolayevich Zaykov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, CPSU Central Committee secretary, and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom; Mirazolim Ibragimovich Ibragimov, chairman, Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Daynis Evaldovich Ivans, chairman, Latvian People's Front; Tulepbergen Kaipbergenov, chairman of the board, Karakalpak ASSR Writers Union; Chary Kakadzhikov, brigade leader, 40 Let TSSR Kolkhoz, Ashkhabadskiy Rayon, Turkmen SSR; Vladimir Ivanovich Kolesnikov, department head, Rostov Railroad Transportation Engineers Institute; Marina Rizayevna Kontselidze, kolkhoz citrus grower, Khala Village, Kobletskiy Rayon, Georgian SSR; Nadezhda Aleksandrovna Kryuchenkova, teacher, Inzhavinov Secondary School No 2, Tambov Oblast; Ionas Pyatrovich Kubilyus, rector, Vilnyus State University, Lithuanian SSR; Vladimir Nikolayevich Kudryavtsev, vice president, USSR Academy of Sciences, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the State and Law; Kirill Yuryevich Lavrov, actor, Leningrad Gorkiy Academic Bolshoy Drama Theater, chairman of the board of the USSR Union of Theater Workers; Ivan Dmitriyevich Laptev, editor in chief of the newspaper IZVESTIYA SOVETOV NARODNYKH DEPUTATOV SSSR; Maryu Yokhannesovna Lauristin, department head, Tartu State University, Estonian SSR; Dmitriy Sergeyevich Likhachev, academician, head of sector, USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Russian Literature, chairman of the board of the Soviet Culture Foundation; Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member; Kirill Trofimovich Mazurov, chairman, All-Union Council of War and Labor Veterans; Guriy Ivanovich Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Vitaliy Andreyevich Masol, chairman, Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers; Vyacheslav Nikolayevich Matyukha, head of a comprehensive brigade, Construction Administration No 36, Mamontovnefteпromstroy Trust, Tyumen Oblast; Roy Aleksandrovich Medvedev, writer; Sergey Tikhonovich Melekhin, machine tool operator, large-sections shop, Nizhnyy Tagil Metallurgical Combine, Sverdlovsk Oblast; Mikhail Alekseyevich Moiseyev, chief of general staff of the USSR Armed Forces, USSR first deputy minister of defense; Nursultan Abishevich Nazarbayev, chairman of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers; Konstantin Vladimirovich Nechayev, bishop of Volokolamsk and Yuryev Pitirim, chairman, publishing department, Moscow Patriarchy; Nadezhda Petrovna Nechetnaya, spinning worker at the Lenin Factory, Bryansk Oblast; Gaibnazar Pallayev, chairman, Tadzhik SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Nikolay Dmitriyevich Pivovarov, chairman, executive committee, Rostov Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies; Semen Ivanovich Platon, chairman, executive committee, Kagul City Soviet of People's Deputies, Moldavian SSR; Gavriil Kharitonovich Popov, editor in chief of the journal VOPROSY EKONOMIKI; Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World Economics and International Relations; Tadeush Karlovich Pupkevich, machine operator, rocking excavator, Narvskiy Open Pit, Estonslanets Production Association, Sillamyaz City, Estonian SSR; Georgiy Petrovich Razumovskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member and CPSU Central Committee secretary; Murtaza Gubaydullovich Rakhimov, director, Ufa XXII Syezda KPSS Petroleum Refinery, Bashkir ASSR; Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman, USSR Council of Ministers, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member; Nazira Sabirova, brigade leader, Yangiabad Sovkhoz, Gurlenskiy Rayon, Khorezma Oblast, Uzbek SSR; Anatoliy Mitrofanovich Sbitnev, steel smelter, Kommunarsk Metallurgical Combine, Voroshilovgrad Oblast; Yefrem Yevseyevich Sokolov, first secretary, Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; Vasiliy Aleksandrovich Starodubtsev, chairman, Lenin Kolkhoz-Breeding

Farm, Novomoskovskiy Rayon, Tula Oblast; Galina Ivanovna Stoumova, chief of shop, Gatchinskiy Sovkhoz, Leningrad Oblast; Yekaterina Davydovna Stupina, rayon hospital pediatrician, Tavricheskiy Rayon, Omsk Oblast; Olzhas Omarovich Suleymenov, writer, first secretary of the board, Kazakhstan Writers Union; Valentina Vladimirovna Tereshkova, Presidium chairman, Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries; Viktor Ivanovich Trefilov, vice president of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, director of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Material Science Problems; Vilesha Khachaturovich Khachatryan, motor vehicle driver, Zangezur Copper-Molybdenum Combine, Armenian SSR; Adamali Koshokovich Yusupov, head of the face breakage mining link, Mine imeni Leninskiy Komsomol, Kyzyl-Kiyskoye Mine Administration, Kirghiz SSR; Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, CPSU Central Committee secretary; and Arkadiy Petrovich Yamenko, rector, Novosibirsk Engineering-Construction Institute.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Thank you. I must make a small addition to those names. Comrade Ivan Afanasyevich Vasilyev, writer, Pskov Oblast, was also nominated member of the commission. Comrade Azizbekov may have simply omitted his name. I am therefore adding it.

Are there motions concerning the membership of the editorial commission? Are there supplements? Do you wish to nominate someone?

G.G. Borovikov, work superintendent, specialized mechanized operations administration No 10, Sochispetsstroy Territorial Construction Association (Sochinskiy Territorial Electoral District): In order not to set up a precedent in praising our CPSU Central Committee General Secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, I object to Chingiz Aytmatov. (Applause). I nominate Bunich.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Please continue.

B.V. Kryzhkov, deputy production chief, Dzerzhinsk Kaprolaktam Production Association (Dzerzhinskiy Territorial Electoral District): Comrades, I simply wish to make a rejoinder on the microphone but I do not understand why the microphone is not turned on? Is it just for decoration? This is an interpolation. I listened carefully and I may be wrong but I did not hear the nomination of a single engineer. Naturally, it is possible that it was not contemplated that an engineer may turn out to be also a delegate. I believe, however, that it is time to realize that an engineer as well could be a delegate and obviously an engineer would have to be present among 60 people.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Do you have a specific motion?

B.V. Kryzhkov: Kuzubov, chief of shop, Gorkiy Oblast.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: One minute, please, order.

From the hall: I nominate economist Nikolay Nikolayevich Engver, doctor of sciences, representative of the Udmurt Autonomous Republic.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Please.

A.L. Plotnikov, foreman, Kirovo-Chepetsk Machine Repair Plant (from the All-Union Komsomol): Since we do not find in the list a single representative of young people and engineers, and it was said here that there are none, I have a motion: to include in the list Viktor Mikhaylovich Minin, machine shop chief, Glebovskoye Production Poultry Association, Istrinskiy Rayon, Moscow Oblast.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Please.

V.N. Bushuyev, director, Siberian Scientific Research Power Industry Institute, Novosibirsk (from the USSR Union of Scientific and Engineering Societies): I believe that such a composition of the commission, numbering more than 50 people, would be unable independently to draft any document. Therefore, there is a draft for such a document. I motion that it be distributed tomorrow to all the deputies. Then that commission could receive our suggestions. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: No one has written any such special draft. In this case a great deal is based on the results of the debates. We can draw up a new list today, tomorrow, and so on. At that point we would probably spend half the time talking and arguing about the individual candidates. If there is any specific motion, we could consider it. Four nominations were submitted here. If supported by the congress, we could include them and vote for the commission. (Stirring in the hall).

Now, as to the rejection of Comrade Aytmatov. (Stirring in the hall). I believe that it is not mandatory for others to speak in favor of Comrade Aytmatov. Chingiz Aytmatov has not asked for help in this matter. I believe that we could leave the name of Chingiz Aytmatov as a deputy in this list.

A motion has been filed of adding to this list, which was read, Comrades Bunich, Kuzubov, Engver, and Minin, suggested by the comrades. Does the congress support the motion?

From the hall: (Unintelligible).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: I then put the matter to a vote. Those in favor of this list with the additions, please raise your hands.

Thank you. You may lower your hands.

Who is against? Please count the votes.

A.G. Kostenyuk: Dear deputies, 30 deputies voted against.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Thus, 30 deputies were against. Abstentions? Please count.

A.G. Kostenyuk: Twenty-four deputies abstained.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: I beg your pardon, how many?

A.G. Kostenyuk: Twenty-four.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Twenty-four abstained. Therefore, by majority vote we approved the commission's membership.

We have two more commissions that we have to set up. In this case matters may be more difficult. Thus, on your instruction, the Presidium of this congress closely considered all the motions which were received on the membership of the commission and held additional consultations. This is in relation to the commission on Tbilisi.

Therefore, deputies who, in your opinion, could study and evaluate all the materials on such problems independently and objectively were nominated.

The motion has been filed of including the following deputies in the commission to investigate the circumstances related to the Tbilisi events of 9 April. Since constant changes are being made in the membership of the commission, allow me to read the names. This would take no more than 5 minutes, perhaps even 4.

Commission chairman: Nursultan Abishevich Nazarbayev, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Kazakh SSR. Commission members: Khardo Yulovich Aasmyaz, head of sector at the Maynor Design-Engineering Bureau, Estlegprom Association, Tallinn; Sergey Andreyevich Andronati, director of the A.V. Bogatskiy Physics-Chemistry Institute, Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, Odessa; Oleg Georgiyevich Gazenko, academician, adviser at the office of the Institute of Medical-Biological Problems, USSR Ministry of Health, Moscow; Natalya Petrovna Bekhtereva, academician, director of the Scientific Research Institute of Experimental Medicine, USSR Academy of Medical Sciences, Leningrad; Genrikh Aviezerovich Borovik, writer, political commentator, USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, chairman of the Soviet Peace Committee, Moscow; Aleksandr Ivanovich Golyakov, first deputy chairman of the All-Union Council of War and Labor Veterans, Moscow; Vladimir Leonidovich Goborov, army general, chief of civil defense, USSR deputy minister of defense, Moscow; Dmitriy Sergeyevich Likhachev, academician, head of sector, Institute of Russian Literature (Pushkin House), USSR Academy of Sciences, chairman of the board of the Soviet Cultural Foundation, Leningrad; Vladimir Petrovich Lukin, gas cutter, Kolomna V.V. Kuybyshev Diesel Locomotives Manufacturing Plant, Moscow Oblast; Vilen Arutyunovich Martirosyan, colonel, commander of Army Unit 70425, Carpathian Military District, Rovno; Viktor Mikhaylovich Miroshnik, major general, chairman, Committee for State Security, Kazakh SSR, Alma-Ata; Konstantin Vladimirovich Nechayev, Volokolamsk and Yuryev Pitirim bishop, chairman of the publishing department, Moscow Patriarchate, Moscow; Rizoali Kadamshoyevich Odzhiyev, deputy chairman, Internatsionalist Cooperative Association, Tadzhik SSR, Dushanbe; Roald Zinnurovich Sagdeyev, academician, head of the Scientific-Methodical Center for Analytical Research, Institute of Space Research, USSR Academy of Sciences, Moscow; Anatoliy Aleksandrovich Sobchan, department head, Law School, Leningrad State University, Leningrad; Sergey Borisovich Stankevich, senior scientific associate, Institute of General History, USSR Academy of Sciences, Moscow; Vilen Fedorovich Tolpezhnikov, head of office, First Riga City N. Burdenko Clinical Hospital for Urgent Medical Aid, Riga; Vitas Pyatrovich Tomkus, journalist, Vilnius; Valentina Ivanovna Fedotova, editor in chief of the journal SOVETSKAYA ZHENSHCHINA, Moscow; Eldar Nikolayevich Shengelaya, Gruziya-Film Movie Studio director, Tbilisi; Pavel Vadimovich Shetko, lecturer, propaganda department, Minsk Oblast Komsomol Committee, Belorussian SSR, Minsk; Aleksandr Maksimovich Yakovlev, doctor of juridical sciences, head of sector, Institute of the State and Law, USSR Academy of Science, Moscow.

This is the membership of the commission appointed to investigate the Tbilisi events of 9 April, suggested by the Presidium.

Please, comrades, do not be in a hurry.

Are there any other motions concerning the membership of the commission?

From the hall: Vasilyev.

M.S. Gorbachev: The way I understand it he wanted to switch from another commission to this one.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Do we include Comrade Vasilyev?

A.N. Tavkhelidze, president of the Academy of Sciences of the Georgian SSR, Tbilisi (Shukhumi Rural National-Territorial District, Abkhaz ASSR): Deeply honored deputies: Let me inform you of the following: The moment the 9 April tragedy occurred, the Georgian scientific public and the Georgian public came out with a suggestion, and a commission was appointed by the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet. It included outstanding Georgian scientists in the areas of law, medicine, and political studies. The commission did a tremendous amount of work. Let me say that the commission worked with the great support of the scientific and general public in Georgia. There is a conclusion on the part of this commission on the subject of legal and medical problems

and the chemical problem. All of this is at your disposal. The only thing we do not know is, to put it simply, who is it that appointed our deputy to head this operation? I forget his name.... Well, military commanders, who appointed him? Rodionov?

Mikhail Sergeyevich, on the second day or 2 or 3 days later, a new commission was appointed, headed by Deputy Tarazevich. The commission came to Tbilisi and worked there. It did not meet a single time with the deputies or with the other commission and did not take into consideration the opinion of the public. (Stirring in the hall).

Voice: That is why a commission is set up.

A.N. Tavkhelidze: Wait, wait.... How many times could a commission be set up? Let me just say that the commission worked, that there is such a commission. If our purpose is to draw the attention away, then you are right. In that case let Tarazevich answer why his commission was unable to establish the truth and why we are wasting people's money on assignments? What did they do, stay for a while in Tbilisi and leave? (Stirring in the hall). Let me just say that the only question remaining is the legality of imposing a curfew. Please, I beg of you, let Tarazevich answer us why his commission was unable to determine what was happening? (Stirring in the hall).

Voice: You are wrong!

A.N. Tavkhelidze: Why am I wrong? Let Tarazevich answer why he did not find out. Are we children or what? (Stirring in the hall).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Comrades, a motion has been filed to set up a commission, to do something.... Later one could already.... Comrades, there is a request to speak out only on the subject of the commission. Let us stick to that.

A.K. Safonov, chief of the Design-Construction Association, Alma-Ata House Building Combine (Alma-Ata-Alatauskiy Territorial District, Alma-Ata): I believe that the head of the commission cannot be a representative of any one of the republics. In my view, this would not be entirely objective. A motion was made yesterday to appoint Comrade Yakovlev, Politburo member, chairman of the commission. The Kazakh delegation insists on it. (Applause).

Deputy (name not given): I would like to make a statement to Deputy Gorbachev, Supreme Soviet chairman. Despite the demands of the voters, General Rodionov continues to attend the session. His address of yesterday indicated his belief in the legitimacy of the act of political assassination he committed. (Stirring in the hall). My conscience and convictions. (Applause) do not allow me to cooperate with murderers. (Stirring in the hall). I therefore resign as deputy for as long as General Rodionov will remain among us. (Stirring in the hall).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Comrades, one thing at a time. (Stirring in the hall). Comrades, let us deal with the matter at hand. We are creating a commission, let us discuss the commission members.

T.M. Shamba, party committee secretary, CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences, Moscow (Gudautskiy Rural National-Territorial District, Abkhaz ASSR): Dear comrades, 2 days prior to the congress and for 5 days during the congress I have asked to speak on a variety of matters, so that I could express my views. I must tell you that the events we are discussing are related to the Abkhaz problem. I therefore would like, I request and insist, that tomorrow the floor be given to the representative of the Abkhaz ASSR to clear up the matter of the "guilt" of the Abkhaz people in these events.

A.A. Korshunov, brigade leader, Tashkent Aviation Production Association imeni V.P. Chkalov, Uzbek SSR, Tashkent (from the USSR trade unions): Yesterday all of you or many of you saw that film. Yesterday for several hours we discussed the matter of this commission. Volskiy said the right things here but only on an entirely different subject. This was so painful and so sensitive that today once again we are beginning to stir up passions in the hall. You can now imagine what is taking place there, in Tbilisi, in Georgia, and everywhere else. I beg of you, I conjure you not to stir up such passions! We are discussing a commission. This commission is quite extensive. All strata of our society are represented in it. Let us now put an end to the discussion on this topic and allow this commission to work! (Tempestuous applause). It includes many people, different people, and they will tell us and the entire Soviet people the truth, let us stop fanning the fire on this topic! (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Anyone else? Please. Do you have a motion? About the commission? Please.

M.N. Poltoranin, political commentator, NOVOSTI Press Agency, Moscow (from the USSR Union of Journalists): On the subject of the motions which were made here: to include Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev in the commission. We are setting up our first commissions and shall have to set up many other commissions. I believe that we should not include in such commissions Politburo members. As to the motion concerning Chairman Nazarbayev I, for instance, have known him for the past 20 years. He is a very objective comrade and he can make a full investigation. I would like you to second this motion.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Please to turn on Bishop Pitirim's microphone.

Bishop Pitirim: Please excuse me, I would like to address a question to the chairman. Is it in order for members of another commission to participate in this commission? (Stirring in the hall).

From the hall: These are different commissions. If there are no objections to the deputies who were nominated here, we believe this to be possible, the more so since there will be no time conflict and they will be able to do their job. If there are resignations, let us hear them. (Stirring in the hall).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: So, comrades, I see by the reaction in the hall that we must already vote on the commission. The last deputy.

T.Kh. Gdlyan, senior investigator for particularly important cases under the USSR Prosecutor General, Moscow (Tushinskiy Territorial Electoral District, Moscow): Academician Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov has participated in all the stages in the work of the commission investigating the Tbilisi tragedy. I move that Academician Sakharov be made part of this commission as well.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: According to our data, Academician Sakharov has refused. That is the reason for which he is not in it.

T.Kh. Gdlyan: In that case, please excuse me.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Comrade Nazarbayev. He probably has the right to speak, for he is a member of that commission. Please.

N.A. Nazarbayev, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Kazakh SSR (Alma-Ata-Iliyskiy Territorial Electoral District): I thank the Presidium for its trust. We are solving difficult problems. It would be wrong if everyone to whom such problems are assigned would begin to refuse them. The Kazakh people respect the Georgian people profoundly. Their pain is shared by all of us. Yesterday, having heard the Georgian side, we realized that the Georgians are firmly defending their opinion. We developed a different view after listening to General Rodionov. We saw the film yesterday from beginning to end. I beg the comrades to excuse me but the impression we gathered was that it presented no facts whatsoever other than the opinion of the announcer. (Applause). For that reason, dear comrade deputies, if I am given such an assignment I pledge to carry it out honestly and conscientiously. Nonetheless, bearing in mind that it is a question of national republics, I would still ask that a neutral person be appointed. (Stirring in the hall).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: The entire list consists of people with a nationality, there is not a single person without nationality. (Applause).

N.A. Nazarbayev: Second, this entire matter must be investigated. For example, Comrade Tarazevich was there and investigated. The new chairman will have to investigate all of these problems all over again. You must decide. I have expressed my view and would like you to take it into consideration.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: So, comrades, I put the matter to a vote. The name of Comrade Lev Borisovich Vasilyev has been added to the names of the members of th commission.

From the hall: Boris Lvovich.

From the hall: (Unintelligible).

R.Sh. Tabukashvili, head of the Gruziya-Film Motion Picture Studio Scenario Association (Batumi National-Territorial Electoral District, Georgian SSR): Taking into consideration that now the future chairman of the commission has already predetermined his attitude toward the events, I categorically insist that he withdraw his candidacy—that is, that we honor his request of withdrawing his candidacy. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: How, comrades?

From the hall: Please submit a motion to name the people who are obstructing the investigation.

V.F. Tolpezhnikov, head of office, First Riga State Clinical Hospital for Urgent Medical Aid imeni N. Burdenko (Proletarskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Latvian SSR): I fully second the motion of my colleague for Lithuania. How many more commissions should there be? I have asked an entirely specific question: Who sanctioned this murder? (Stirring in the hall).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: The commission will answer.

V.F. Tolpezhnikov (from his seat): I asked my question on the 25th. Yesterday I repeated my question again. So far there has been no answer. Do you think that our government does not know who issued the order? If such is the case, who needs such a government. (Stirring in the hall). I ask that we express our lack of confidence in our government which does not know who within it ordered the destruction of its own people. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Quiet, comrades, quiet. What are you suggesting?

From the hall: (Unintelligible).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Comrades, let us have silence and quiet. We are repeating our discussion of yesterday, in the same spirit. Since the question concerning the chairman has come up, I would suggest to the congress to vote on the chairman. On the chairman, separately and then on all members of the commission. Is this motion seconded?

From the hall: (Unintelligible).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: I did not gather that Comrade Nazarbayev has withdrawn his candidacy. That is not the way we understood it.

From the hall: (Unintelligible).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Comrades, there is yet another motion. Pay attention. There is another motion: not to choose a chairman now, let the commission itself choose its chairman and his deputy. Comrade Nazarbayev, do you insist that your name be withdrawn? Or will you remain member of the commission? Comrade Nazarbayev remains member of the commission. Therefore, a motion has been made not to single out a chairman but to vote for the list which I read, adding Comrade Boris Lvovich Vasilyev to it. This will be the membership of the commission. I put the matter to a vote. Those in favor of this commission, please say so. Thank you. Who is against? Please count the votes.

A.G. **Kostenyuk**: Dear deputies, there were 21 against.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Against, 21. Abstentions? Please raise your certificates.

A.G. Kostenyuk: Seventy-four deputies abstained.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Thus, the membership of the commission has been approved by majority vote. The commission will choose its chairman.

M.S. Gorbachev: With the participation of the Presidium.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: With the participation, naturally, of the Presidium, if this becomes necessary. Thus, we have approved the commission. Thank you. Now a few remarks on procedural matters. Comrade Mambetov has the floor.

A.M. Mambetov, artistic director, Drama Theater imeni M. Auezov, chairman of the board of the Union of Theater Workers of Kazakhstan (from the Union of USSR Theater Workers): Comrades, there is in our congress pluralism of opinions, criticism, and self-criticism. All of this is good. However, I would request that the personality of the artist, of the man, not be insulted. This affects us, creative workers, profoundly. (Applause). In this case I am referring to what was said about Chingiz Aytmatov. For if the comrade who spoke has the necessary courage, let him apologize to Chingiz Aytmatov. In the future, I ask the people's deputies, as Academician Likhachev said, that proper standards be maintained in the debates. I thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Thank you. Still on procedural matters, Comrade Sazonov has the floor. Please.

N.S. Sazonov, party committee secretary, automated machine tool production, Kama Motor Vehicles Plant (Naberezhno-Chelninskiy Territorial Electoral District, Tatar ASSR): Dear deputies, naturally, we have been working for 6 days, and we are somewhat tired. I call upon you, however, to pay close attention. This morning all of you received a form, a paper on registrations for committees and commissions, i.e., the draft structure of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which was not discussed. We believe that this draft triggers a number of doubts and does not reflect the key directions in the development of our society. We therefore suggest the following: first, to halt registrations on this draft; second, to set up a task force consisting of one deputy per republic and one for Moscow and Leningrad each, to formulate a draft structure of the USSR Supreme Soviet; third, to discuss and approve it and only then resume the registration. Why? We already made a grave error in setting up the USSR Supreme Soviet, which includes 231 members among the first leaders of party, soviet, and economic authorities who, as a rule, will not be present and our parliament will not be a permanent one. That is why I submit this motion.

Finally, I would like to voice a certain objection to the Presidium for the harm caused to autonomous republics, oblasts, and districts: We have been discussing for the past 2 days and not one person has spoken on behalf of the autonomous republics. I thank you for your attention.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: We shall take into consideration the remarks made by the comrades.

A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet: Comrades, a significant percentage of the deputies have already expressed their wish as to the commissions in which they would like to participate. I believe that we must finish with this work and submit our motions. A number of deputies have suggestions as to the structure, names of the commissions, and so on. For example, Deputy Stankevich has suggested a somewhat different structure of the commissions themselves. Once we have collected all the suggestions, we could meet with the group of deputies who have suggested changes, and thus work further on the composition of such commissions and submit them to you for your final consideration. And also this: The list which has been offered to you takes extensively into consideration the suggestions of the deputies themselves. A great many of them have made suggestions and they have been taken into consideration in this list.

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades, the question of statements by representatives of autonomous areas is quite serious. As you can see, not even all Union republics have been able to speak. You have noted—information on this subject, in my view, was distributed—that 469 people have already put their names down to speak.

From the hall: And 250 have spoken.

M.S. Gorbachev: From the very beginning, there have been 250. Once again the comrades are asking a question which was already asked in the past: In order not to deprive anyone, that all representatives of republics speak 15 minutes each, i.e., tomorrow allocate 15 minutes each to the representatives of Moldavia and Turkmeniya and then, perhaps, reduce the speeches by 5 minutes: speak for 10 minutes each. We have approved a regulation. Although temporary, this is already our program. Should we change it? I never hurry to change something once we have approved it. However, the congress has the right to decide. The situation is as follows: Many people have put their names down and it is desirable—everything seems to indicate this, comrades—for the maximum possible number of people to speak. If the comrades can consider their speeches and say everything in 10 minutes, as was done by Comrade Pukhova, we would welcome this. Do you agree? Not to change anything so far?

From the hall: Not to.

M.S. Gorbachev: Now, as to the autonomous areas. Comrade Kugultinov, I am about to finish. Or do you wish to ask a question?

From the hall: (Unintelligible).

M.S. Gorbachev: No, Comrade Kugultinov, on the contrary. The congress ratifies the regulation. Now, comrades, another question. "Yesterday at the evening session," Deputy Bratun said, "I submitted a motion that at the end of each session 1 hour be set aside for brief statements, declarations, and so on, strictly limited to 3-5 minutes. So far there has been no answer and I ask that this be determined."

From the hall: (Unintelligible).

M.S. Gorbachev: This will be a supplement to our regulation, comrades. For that reason we must set aside: Either work until 6 and add another hour, to 7 pm, for answers, or else allocate 1 hour, from 5 to 6, for short statements. Shall we change or not?

From the hall: No.

M.S. Gorbachev: Therefore, we ratify the regulation?

From the hall: Yes.

M.S. Gorbachev: That is all, thank you.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: That is all, comrades. All the questions which were raised.... (Stirring in the hall). What is happening?

From the hall: Comrade chairman, you promised to read at the end of the session (Further unintelligible; noise in the hall).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: I promised to pass on your motions. We could read them at the morning session. Sit down, comrades. Let me name them: Brutsa, Mitin, Niyazov, Likhanov, Chernichenko, and Khmura—those deputies will speak tomorrow, during the first session. I wish you a pleasant rest. Until tomorrow, 1000.